DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 429 CG 018 988

AUTHOR Heuser, James Paul
TITLE The Problems and Needs of Juvenile Court Wards in Oregon.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Dept. of Justice, Salem. Crime Analysis Center.
SPONS AGENCY Marion County Family Court, Salem, OR.
PUB DATE Oct 84
NOTE 106p.; Prepared under Marion County Agreement Number 3473.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Individual Needs; *Juvenile Courts; *Needs Assessment; *Policy Formation; Problems; *Social Services
IDENTIFIERS Oregon

ABSTRACT

This document is an assessment of the service needs of one state's juvenile court wards written by a group of representatives of private and governmental agencies involved in working with children in the juvenile justice system. The group's goals were to generate accurate program and fiscal information about the juvenile justice and juvenile service systems in Oregon and to use this information to guide analyses of state policies and to develop policy recommendations. The document describes research design, sampling design, and census. Results of a needs assessment survey on a representative sample of juvenile court wards are discussed; questions investigated included the following: (1) characteristics of sample court wards; (2) problems in client profiles related to juvenile court status or referral history; (3) the child's past or present danger of abuse, neglect or exploitation; (4) treatment settings needed by the wards; (5) the need to remove a child from his own home; (6) needed services; and (7) other information availability. Suggested areas of future research conclude the report. The survey instruments are appended. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CG

ED268429

PREPARED FOR
MARION COUNTY FAMILY COURT

ALBIN W. NORBLAD
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

MICHAEL GREENFIELD
DIRECTOR

THE PROBLEMS AND NEEDS OF JUVENILE COURT WARDS IN OREGON

CG 0189883

PREPARED BY
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
CRIME ANALYSIS CENTER

DAVE FROHNMAYER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

CLINTON GOFF
JIM HEUSER
STAFF

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James Paul Heuser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE PROBLEMS AND NEEDS OF JUVENILE COURT WARDS IN OREGON

by

JAMES PAUL HEUSER, PH.D.
Researcher
Crime Analysis Center
Criminal Justice Division
Department of Justice
Justice Building
Salem OR 97310

October 1984

Prepared Under Marion County Agreement Number 3473.

"Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Marion County Family Court or the Department of Justice."

For more information regarding this report, contact Dr. James Paul Heuser, Researcher; or Dr. Clinton C. Goff, Supervisor, at (503) 378-4229.

PREFACE

To do an adequate job of acknowledging all those who contributed to the successful completion of this project would take up considerably more space than I have.

In order to get the kind of needs assessment that was needed was not a particularly easy task. Initially, Alan Hershey of the Mid-Valley Council of Governments organized an effort to retrieve Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act money from the Juvenile Services Commission. The Council of Governments had previously turned the funds over to the Juvenile Services Commission for distribution. Mr. Hershey organized a Juvenile Justice Committee to review local grant applications without benefit of administrative funds which were kept by the Juvenile Services Commission, and with the support of the Marion County Family Court completed staff work needed to comply with federal regulations for distribution of the monies. The committee unanimously endorsed the project, even though it was not focused directly on Marion County and not focused directly on direct services to children. The funds had originally been earmarked to get status offenders out of detention. Inasmuch as Marion County had accomplished that goal seven years prior, I made the decision to use the funds for a professionally done needs assessment.

Considerable staff work and research was done by Vicki Gates of Children's Services Division; Mike Greenfield of the Marion County Family Court; and Alan Hershey of the Council of Governments. The obvious choice to do the research was the State of Oregon Crime Analysis Center. Fortunately, Clinton Goff and Jim Heuser of the Crime Analysis Center agreed to take on the project. Without their guidance, professionalism and hard work, the project could never have been completed.

Particular thanks go to Jim Heuser who designed and executed the assessment.

Mike Greenfield served as project officer and was helpful in aiding the progress of the study.

I would also note the contribution of Mr. Don Miller, who offered a steadying hand to a shifting group of individuals who assisted Jim Heuser in his research work.

What we finally have before us is a long overdue assessment of the needs of children in Oregon.

It is my view that the information gained through this project is especially needed because service delivery systems for children in Oregon have evolved circumstantially and without any long-term strategy to guide thinking in action of policy-makers.

There now exists a reliable data base which can yield answers to questions of the legislature and the executive branch of government. What this data base probably does, however, is ask more questions than it answers. It is my hope that some branch of state government will find the funds to continue this research and provide a much larger body of reliable information for policy-makers in the juvenile justice arena.

Albin W. Norblad
Circuit Court Judge

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
What is The Policy Planning Task Force?	1
Why Was This Study Initiated?	3
What Data Were to be Included in This Client-Based Needs Assessment Study?	3
What Juveniles Were to be Included in This Proposed Client-Based Needs Assessment Study?	4
Who Specifically is Included in This Client-Based Needs Assessment Study and Why?	4
Who Should Assess the Problems and Needs of the Juvenile Court Wards in This Study?	6
THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION STEPS	7
The Components or Steps in the Research Design for This Study	7
The Census (Via Mail Questionnaires of Juvenile Court Wards in Oregon	10
The Selection of a Representative Sample of Juvenile Court Wards in Oregon and the Administration of the Needs Assessment Questionnaire to Their Counselors and Caseworkers	15
THE RESULTS OF THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY ON A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF JUVENILE COURT WARDS IN OREGON	18
What Background or Demographic Characteristics Do Our Sample Court Wards Have and Are There Differences Between the Subsamples of Juvenile Department and CSD Supervised Cases?	19
What Were the Reasons for These Wards' Current Juvenile Court Status?	26
What is Unique About the Juvenile Court Referral History of These Juvenile Court Wards?	31
What Problems in the Client Profiles of These Wards Are Related to Their Current Juvenile Court Status or Prior Referral History and Consequently to Their Current Service Needs?	32

THE RESULTS OF THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY ON A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF JUVENILE COURT WARDS IN OREGON (Cont'd.)

Is This Child Currently in Danger of Abuse, Neglect, or Exploitation? 33

Was This Child Ever in the Past in Danger of Abuse, Neglect, or Exploitation?. 33

What Individual Problems Were These Wards Rated as Presenting the JJS and Its Service Delivery System?. 34

What Treatment Settings Do These Wards Need? 36

Is Removal From the Child's Own Home a Mandatory Aspect or Requirement For an Ideal Service Treatment Setting for This Child?. 37

What Services Do These Wards Currently Need and How Adequate Are the Level of Services Being Received? 37

Were New Primary and Secondary Services Needed by These Wards?. 41

What Other Information Is Available on These Juvenile Court Wards?. 43

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM THE PRELIMINARY DATA ANALYSES AND WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE? 43

APPENDICES

TABLES

Table 1 - Telephone Survey Responses to Questions 1a, 1b, and 1c Arrayed by County 9

Table 2 - Frequency Distribution on Various Demographic and Other "Face Sheet" Variables for the Total Sample and the Juvenile Department and CSD Subsamples 20

Table 3 - Frequency Distribution on Variables Reflecting Current Juvenile Court Status for the Total Sample and the Juvenile Department and CSD Subsamples 27

Table 4 - Current vs. Ideal Service/Treatment Settings for Juvenile Court Wards 36

Table 5 - Percent of Current Court Wards Needing Particular Services and Receiving an Adequate Level by Type of Service Rated . . . 38

Table 6 - Number and Percent of Current Court Wards Needing Particular Services and Receiving an Adequate Level of Service by Type of Service Rated 42

FIGURE

Figure 1 - Description of Target Groups for Each Data Form Used in the Needs Assessment Study Census. 11

INTRODUCTION

This study is an attempt to provide for the first time an in-depth, comprehensive assessment of the service needs of juvenile court wards in Oregon. The research for this study was performed under contract by the Crime Analysis Center of the Department of Justice for the Policy Planning Task Force (PPTF). The Marion County Council of Governments developed, in cooperation with the Department of Justice, a contract for this study using federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act monies administered by the state Juvenile Services Commission. The director of the Marion County Family Court acted as project officer for this grant.

To better understand the purposes and goals of this study, the reader needs answers to the questions which follow.

What is the Policy Planning Task Force?

The PPTF is an ad hoc group of representatives of private and state and local government agencies working with children in the Juvenile Justice System (JJS). The history of the group dates back to early 1982 and a series of meetings in Salem designed to focus the group's attention on JJS goals, policies and philosophies in an effort to improve that system in Oregon.

While the PPTF's longevity in the JJS was to be of limited duration, it was hoped that the work of this group would have a long-term impact on JJS planning and policy making--especially in regards to service delivery, coordination and planning.

Eventually, it was hoped that the work products of this task force would provide a base and starting point for the work of other policy groups, and particularly, the new Governor's Task Force on Juvenile Corrections alternatives--which incidently the group helped to develop through its drafting and support of House Joint Resolution 35 (HJR 35) during the 1983 regular session of the Oregon Legislative Assembly.

The tie to this new task force is important as its mission is to recommend policies, priorities and standards for the state's delivery of services to

youth. One provision of HJR 35 (Section 8, d) deserves special attention in that it recommended that this new task force include for study the subject of assessing "...the treatment, care and education needs of children within the jurisdiction of juvenile courts, including provisions of P.L. 94.142 and related state statutes."

For its own work, the PPTF identified two (2) major purposes which can be identified as follows:

1. To generate accurate program and fiscal information about the juvenile justice and juvenile service systems in Oregon, and

2. To use this knowledge base and agreed upon values to guide analyses of policies governing Oregon's juvenile justice/juvenile services systems, and develop policy recommendations aimed at shaping the most appropriate spectrum and distribution of services for troubled youth and their families.

In attempting to accomplish its purposes, the PPTF identified two types of cases or youth to include in the universe of juveniles of policy concern. These are as follows:

Formal Juvenile Justice System Cases - Cases where a petition has been filed in juvenile court because children have committed crimes or are found to be victims of crime, and children who are dependents of the court. Children who have committed crimes include those who have committed status offenses.

Informal Juvenile Justice System Cases - Children judged by professionals as likely to become victims of law violations or who are at risk of becoming law violators, or who have been arrested or cited for law violations, including status offenses, but who are handled informally by the juvenile justice system or the nonjudicial system.

To initiate its early work, the PPTF identified several policy questions to be addressed. These were articulated as follows:

1. What do the current juvenile justice and juvenile services systems look like?

2. Is there any general agreement or philosophy and values which could drive or facilitate the operation of these systems--especially the juvenile justice system?

3. What services do clients of the juvenile justice and juvenile services systems need?

4. How can these systems be effectively coordinated to provide client services within current budgetary constraints?

5. What policy issues emerge from these questions?

Why Was This Study Initiated?

As the work of the PPTF progressed, the group focused most of its attention on policy issues related to the delivery of services to youth in the JJS. In particular, PPTF members cited the need to establish a data base which could be used to provide a basis for assessing children's service needs, for matching system resources to these identified needs, for allocating the appropriate resources, and for planning for future needs. A central assumption of the group was that the development of comprehensive, long-range planning for the delivery of services to juveniles and their families must begin with an accurate and detailed needs assessment study of which children need what services and what services they actually receive and at what level of adequacy.

What Data Were to be Included in This Client-Based Needs Assessment Study?

After a somewhat abortive and emotive effort to do a fiscal analysis of certain segments of the juvenile justice system in Oregon, the PPTF once again turned its attention to client needs and agreed to complete a needs assessment study. At this time (roughly May of 1983), the various agencies represented on the PPTF (i.e., the Children's Services Division (CSD), the Juvenile Services Commission (JSC), and the county juvenile courts and departments agreed to participate in the work of a subcommittee of the task force which was to de- fine and lay out the parameters of a statewide client needs assessment study. This subcommittee prepared several working papers and documents including preliminary drafts of a client-based needs assessment questionnaire.

From further discussion and examination of these documents the subcommittee concluded that the needs assessment data to be collected fall into five categories as follows:

1. Data on the child's background characteristics (i.e., demographic data).

2. Data on the child's problems.

3. Data on services the child currently receives.

4. Data on caseworker (or counselor) preferences for services to be delivered to the child.

5. Agency data such as caseload ratios, geographic location and total caseloads.

What Juveniles Were to be Included in This Proposed Client-Based Needs Assessment Study?

Initially, the task force was to focus its attention on all juveniles in contact with the juvenile justice system in Oregon and to some extent with juveniles in general who are exposed to social services in the state. However, as the project evolved and as discussions between the task force study subcommittee and the contractor progressed, it was decided that the scope of the research needed to be narrowed somewhat due to the limited resources and time alloted for the study, as well as, due to priorities for information. A decision, therefore, was made to limit the study population or universe to only those formal cases in the juvenile justice system. Also, it was decided that this population should be limited to those formal cases which were active as of March 15, 1984. The rationale for this decision is examined in the next section of this report.

Who Specifically is Included in This Client-Based Needs Assessment Study and Why?

For this research, the PPTF in consultation with the researcher defined the universe or target population to be included as all juveniles in Oregon under active (or pending) juvenile court jurisdiction/wardship as of March 15, 1984. The term "jurisdiction/wardship" was used to avoid confusion over varying

definitions of what case constitutes a juvenile court ward. The generic or broad definition of an active court ward is simply any child who is under current juvenile court jurisdiction (and, therefore, an "official probation" case and formally supervised) because he or she was adjudicated on a petition where the substantiated complaint involved delinquent (i.e., criminal) and/or status offense charges and/or the circumstances of dependency, abuse, and/or neglect. Also included were the following groups:

1. Juveniles adjudicated and made wards in other states and transferred to Oregon via Interstate Compact for formal supervision here.

2. Juveniles where wardship was pending as of March 15, 1984--i.e., cases where the adjudication hearing and finding of fact have occurred and a separate disposition hearing is still pending.

3. Juvenile court wards under CSD custody and supervision (including those in the state training schools or on juvenile parole).

The specific rationale for the delimiting of the target population for this study included the following arguments and assumptions:

1. The juvenile court ward (as defined here) represents a child who has penetrated the juvenile justice system to the point where that system must respond officially to his or her problem behaviors and/or circumstances. It also must mandate a treatment plan and services and delegate service providers for this child. Because an adjudication (or jurisdictional) hearing and a finding of fact is the basis for wardship, there is usually better (i.e., more reliable and complete) information to substantiate and outline the problems requiring services for this child.

2. The juvenile court ward population is significantly smaller than the population of all juveniles in contact with the juvenile justice system and the service delivery problems posed by these wards represent generally more pressing needs than those of juveniles only informally or unofficially involved with the system. Consequently, a first line approach to serving the needs of a population with more pronounced problems is to provide an in-depth, comprehensive assessment of their unique service needs.

3. Besides the assumption that the service delivery needs of juvenile court wards are more intense and salient than those of non-wards, we also need to point out that wardship generally implies that these clients of the system are more apt to have multiple agency contacts, and on a long term basis and are more apt to

require out-of-home care. As a result, the CSD and related agen- cies providing long-term, alternative care and services are likely to be involved with these cases. Consequently, our view of their problems and service needs includes a broader and more in-depth examination of the network of service delivery agents in the juvenile justice system. This is important given the PPTF's original concerns with the network of CSD services and the complications presented by adding the service dimension of out-of-home care.[1]

Who Should Assess the Problems and Needs of the Juvenile Court Wards in This Study?

Throughout the discussions of the purposes of this study, PPTF members and the contractor agreed that of all the people who could assess a child's problems and needs, the counselor or caseworker responsible for that child's case planning and case management was the most likely candidate. While it would have been useful to have more than one person assess a child's needs, it was felt that because of the limited scope of the study and time and resources, it was necessary to focus on a single individual to assess a child's needs. This individual should be the juvenile department counselor responsible for casework for the child or his or her CSD counterpart--the caseworker identified in the IIS information system as the plan worker.[2]

Although a study of needs and their assessment is always open to the twin issues of the reliability and validity of results, it is our assumption that the results should be much more reliable and valid if we select the most appropriate single parties to assess client needs in the JJS. In short, we are putting our money on the juvenile department counselors and the CSD caseworkers.[3]

---

[1]Methodologically, it is important to point out that because we wanted respondents in this study to complete a very lengthy and comprehensive needs assessment questionnaire on one or more juvenile cases, we felt justified in encouraging the use of a small, representative sample of court wards and in delimiting the population under study to strictly juvenile court wards.

[2]Where we could not find the CSD (case) plan worker in our eventual administration of needs assessment instruments we substituted either the service or the legal worker identified with this case.

[3]It should be pointed out that our juvenile department counselors include both supervision and intake counselors and that the CSD caseworkers include field counselors, as well as, institution or parole counselors.

THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION STEPS

The Components or Steps in the Research Design for This Study

As originally conceived and implemented, the research design for this study had three distinct data collection efforts or components. These are as follows:

1. A telephone survey of juvenile departments;

2. A census of juvenile court wards via a mailed questionnaire sent to various juvenile department staff; and

3. The administration of the needs assessment questionnaire for a representative sample of juvenile court wards in Oregon.

A description of each of these data collection components, the data bases established from each, and the preliminary research findings from each constitutes the next three subsections of this report. We begin with the telephone survey done in February and March of this year.

The Telephone Survey of Juvenile Department Directors and/or Their Assistants

The initial data collection effort for this study consisted of a telephone survey of all 35 juvenile department directors and/or their assistant directors in Oregon's 36 county juvenile departments.[1] The telephone interview schedule for this component of the needs assessment study is included in this report as Appendix A. The main purpose of this survey was to determine the number of juvenile department counselors and supervisory staff (including directors) who carry, as part of their everyday work, full or partial caseloads of juvenile clients on either a formal or informal supervision basis. Also, we were interested in knowing some of the characteristics of these juvenile departments--especially staff and caseload features. The results and findings of this telephone survey have been arranged below by the most pertinent question asked.

---

[1]It should be noted that one juvenile department director serves two counties (Benton and Linn Counties) and two counties (Gilliam and Wheeler) have judges serving as part time directors.

Question 1a: How many counselors are there in your department currently who carry active caseloads (that is they provide formal and informal case supervision services to juvenile referrals)? Give the exact number:_____(a)

Question 1b: Are there supervisory or management staff in your department who have active caseloads of juveniles in addition to those counselors listed above? (That is, do any supervisory staff double as counselors and supervise cases?) If yes, give exact number of individuals doing this:_____(b)

Question 1c: If they answer "yes" to item #1a and #1b, ask them (the respondent) to give you the total number of staff involved--i.e., (a)+(b)=____. Also, ask if the supervisor(s) carry a full caseload or not.

These three questions are all interrelated and together provide a basis for determining the manpower resources of the state's juvenile departments--especially the supply of counselors and supervisory staff who must assume responsibility for caseloads of juvenile court wards and other clients in the state's juvenile justice system.

We have arrayed the data from our survey responses to these three questions in Table 1.

Table 1

Telephone Survey Responses to Questions 1a, 1b, and 1c Arrayed by County

County		Question Number 1a	1b	1c
1	Baker	1	1	2
2	Benton	3	1	4
3	Clackamas	6	1	7
4	Clatsop	2	1	3
5	Columbia	3	1	4
6	Coos	4	0	4
7	Crook	3	1	4
8	Curry	2	0	2
9	Deschutes	7	0	7
10	Douglas	2	1	3
11	Gilliam	0	1	1
12	Grant	1	1	2
13	Harney	1	1	2
14	Hood River	2	1	3
15	Jackson	5	2	7
16	Jefferson	2	0	2
17	Josephine	7	0	7
18	Klamath	4	1	5
19	Lake	1	0	1
20	Lane	7	1	8[a]
21	Lincoln	3	1	4
22	Linn	3	1	4
23	Malheur	3	1	4
24	Marion	24	0	24
25	Morrow	0	1	1
26	Multnomah	22	0	22
27	Polk	3	1	4
28	Sherman	1	0	1
29	Tillamook	2	0	2
30	Umatilla	3	1	4
31	Union	2	0	2
32	Wallowa	0	1	1
33	Wasco	2	1	3
34	Washington	7	2	9
35	Wheeler	0	1	1
36	Yamhill	3	0	3
	Column Totals	141	26	167

[a]This Lane County total excludes intake unit counselors who have no caseloads and investigation unit counselors--both of whom provide some case services. The eight (8) cases listed here, however, constitute the Supervision Unit. This unit has seven (7) counselors and one supervisor who carries a partial caseload of juvenile clients.

As the results in Table 1 indicate, there are 141 counselors in Oregon's 36 juvenile departments who potentially have juvenile court wards on their caseloads. Also, there are an additional 26 supervisory staff in 24 counties who carry partial (or in some cases full) caseloads with potential juvenile court wards. In addition, some counties such as Lane have separate intake staff not included in this table who provide intake and other predispositional hearing casework or counseling services to cases where wardship is pending.

The results of the telephone survey were useful to us in determining the approximate number of people to include in our next research component--the caseload census.[1]

The Census (Via Mailed Questionnaires) of Juvenile Court Wards in Oregon

The second component of this research was to perform (via mailed questionnaires) a census of all juvenile department caseloads in each county to determine their main characteristics and size along with a count and a listing (with identifiers) of active or pending juvenile court wards (as of March 15, 1984)--regardless of whether or not a juvenile department or CSD had the primary casework or case planning and case management responsibilities. Three separate data forms were used in this census effort. Each of these three forms, together with the correspondence and instructions, are included as Appendix B in this report. A brief description of the target population for each census data form (or questionnaire) and who is to complete it follows in Figure 1.

---

[1]As other items were included on the interview schedule (in Appendix A) for the telephone survey, some readers may be interested in responses to these additional items. If this is the case, these can be made available on request.

Figure 1

Description of Target Groups for Each Data Form
Used in the Needs Assessment Study Census

Data Form A Currently active juvenile court wards where the most recent petition resulting in adjudication and wardship involved charges of delinquent (criminal) offenses, status offenses, or charges of dependency, abuse and neglect.

These cases are active (as of March 15, 1984) with a juvenile department counselor on his or her caseload. Therefore, the counselor is responsible for completing this form and listing of identified court wards.

Data Form B Not currently active juvenile court wards, but wardship is pending given that adjudication has recently occurred--i.e., on or before March 15, 1984.

As with the above Form A group, the petition resulting in adjudication (and pending wardship) involved charges of delinquent (criminal) offenses, status offenses, or charges of dependency, abuse and neglect.

These cases may or may not be actively involved with juvenile department counselors. In counties where the generic counselor handles intake services for new cases pending wardship, he or she completes this form on these cases. They would complete, then, a white Form A on their cases which are already court wards and also complete the yellow Form B on those cases where they provide intake services and are consequently the people in a juvenile department most familiar with who these cases are likely to be in a juvenile department. Also, they are probably the counselors who will be providing formal probation services after the dispositional hearing establishes wardship.[1]

Data Form C Active wards of the juvenile court who have been referred to Children's Services Division (CSD) for temporary custody, care and control.

These cases include active juvenile court wards who are in state training schools or on juvenile parole and also include those assigned to CSD caseworkers in the field. In counties where juvenile department counselors jointly supervise court wards with CSD, the department counselor should only include these cases on a white Form A if he or she has primary casework or case management responsibilities for the case. Otherwise, these cases should be listed on Form C as CSD has the primary casework responsibilities. People to fill out this form could include juvenile department or juvenile court staff or someone in either the District Attorney's Office or at the local CSD Office.

---

[1]Of course, in departments with special intake counselors or staff, these people would complete the Form B questionnaire and listing of wardship cases.

Ideally, completion of the Form A census forms or questionnaires should have resulted in a complete count and listing of all currently active court wards (as of March 15, 1984) in Oregon. Each of these cases would be primarily supervised by juvenile department counselors.

Completion of the Form B census forms in turn should have resulted in the complete enumeration and identification of all those adjudicated cases in Oregon where wardship[1] was "pending" due to the need to schedule and complete a dispositional hearing.

Lastly, completion of the Form C census forms should have resulted in a complete count and listing of all juvenile court wards where a CSD caseworker assumed the primary casework responsibilities.[2]

Each of these three counts of mutually exclusive populations when totaled together should result in the total number of juvenile court wards in Oregon active as of March 15, 1984 with all 36 juvenile departments and with CSD. At least, this methodology should have resulted in a reasonably close estimate of the number of court wards given certain inherent problems in conducting a census of this sort via mailed questionnaires.

---

[1]While we continue in this report to use the term juvenile court ward, we are always using it in a generic sense to include any child under juvenile court jurisdiction--i.e., any child who has been adjudicated for any reason. The reasons include criminal offenses, status offenses, or some form of dependency, abuse, and/or neglect.

[2]In some counties or jurisdictions the juvenile department and CSD remain jointly involved with cases, while in other counties or jurisdictions cases dealt with by CSD where it has custody, care, and control are not generally seen by juvenile department counselors. They are "paper cases" in the sense that the juvenile court maintains only a legal file and they are not active with juvenile department counselors.

NOTE TO THE READER:

A listing of the problems of doing a census by mail include respondent carelessness in providing a complete count and listing of wards; poor record keeping in juvenile courts/departments; and intentional and unintentional errors in providing counts and listings of wards. This last point was mentioned because in later attempts to draw a sample from the population of previously identified court wards it was found that some counselors had incorrectly included cases that had never been adjudicated in their listings of court wards. The fact that some counselors had incorrectly included cases that had never been adjudicated in their listings of court wards; the fact that some counselors referred to the study as a "caseload" study; and the fact that others included an unusually large number of "court wards" on their caseloads leads one to question the total accuracy of our counts.

The results of the census are still somewhat inconclusive at this time and probably need to be subjected to further analysis and auditing. However, our preliminary figures indicate that there were somewhere between 10,095 and 11,610 juvenile court wards in Oregon in mid-March to late March, 1984.[1]

We provide this range for our count for a number of reasons. First, the juvenile department counselors who completed the caseload census questionnaires were asked in a question to indicate the exact number of juveniles who were current wards on their caseloads and they were asked to list out their names or provide identifying information on each of them at the end of Form A. Using the responses to the "number" question, we arrive at a figure of 3,430 wards in all. However, the list of identified individual wards contains 4,092 names or identified entries.[2]

The Form B list contains 82 names of "pending wards." The only problem here may be that some pending wardship cases may have been included on A Forms.

The Form C questionnaire on CSD supervised court wards yields somewhat different results than CSD was able to provide from their Integrated Information System (IIS) computer listing of active court wards. All together, juvenile

[1]We speak of late March because CSD furnished us with a computer listing of CSD supervised wards as of March 31, 1984.

[2]A good part of this discrepancy appears to be confined to the census A Forms received from Multnomah County.

department staff completing caseload census C Forms in each county indicated in their name listings that CSD had primary casework responsibility for 7,436 juvenile court wards in Oregon. CSD in generating an IIS listing of wards indicated that there were 6,583 such wards in Oregon.

The low estimate in total number of court wards comes because we have an estimate of 3,430 wards (on the Form A question on number of wards) + 82 (listed names on Form B) + 6,583 (listed names on the CSD IIS computer listing) for a total of 10,095 wards. The high estimate comes from adding 4,092 names on the Form A census questionnaires + 82 (names on the Form B questionnaires) + 7,436 (names listed on the Form C questionnaires) for a total of 11,610 wards.

Because of the use of names on all three census forms or questionnaires, we elected to use the names listed for Form A and Form B to arrive at an estimate of 4,174 juvenile court wards (or pending wards) active as of March 15, 1984 where the juvenile departments had primary casework responsibility.

For estimating the number of CSD cases, we elect to use the IIS computer listing rather than the Form C questionnaires completed by juvenile department staff. Our assumption here is that the wardship information received by CSD and updated to March 31, 1984 via computer entries should be fairly accurate and a more reliable source of data than that generated manually in a one time census of wards conducted via mail questionnaires completed by juvenile court and juvenile department staffs in 36 counties. Therefore, we estimate that the 6,583 names on the IIS computer printout of March 31, 1984 provides the best estimate of the number of CSD supervised court wards as of that date in Oregon.

Adding the above two figures (4,174 and 6,583) together, we arrive at an estimate of 10,757 wards (including 82 pending wards) in Oregon in mid- to late March 1984.

Having arrived at this estimate, we can proceed to describe the next phase of our research.

The Selection of a Representative Sample of Juvenile Court Wards in Oregon and the Administration of the Needs Assessment Questionnaire to Their Counselors or Caseworkers

The final and in many ways the most important phase or component of this research involved the administration of the needs assessment questionnaire for a representative sample of juvenile court wards in Oregon and the collection and analysis of data on their problems and needs. Before looking at the needs assessment instrument and data, however; some mention must be made as to sample selection.

Developing a sampling design for this project was not an easy task for several reasons. First, there were the previously discussed problems in defining and enumerating the population of juvenile court wards in Oregon, i.e., the population from which we had to sample. The failure (due to known and unknown error sources) to have an exact (i.e., error free) count of all such wards means that we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the correspondence we have between our sample and the underlying population of all juvenile court wards. We assume, however, that our sample is reasonably representative of all court wards.[1]

A second problem in sampling has to do with the distribution of needs assessment questionnaires to juvenile department counselors and CSD caseworkers.

---

[1]If there is a serious problem, it may be one of adjusting for under- and over-sampling. That is, we may need to "weight" cases. For example, in our final sample some counties appear to be slightly over-represented and some under-represented. Weighting cases would be a possible solution to this potential problem. Then again, the weights may be difficult to determine if our population figures are distorted due to errors in census data from some counties and not others. In any event, weighting this sample should only be necessary if we are attempting to estimate from our sample how many or what proportion of the larger population have a certain characteristic and it is important that this be done within a certain level of confidence and range of sampling error. Estimating, for example, the number of juvenile court wards in the state who require a certain placement setting or service and attempting to estimate associated costs would be an example where proper weighting of the sample is necessary. In this report (which is basically preliminary and descriptive in nature), we have used the unweighted sample in presenting our data and findings.

Due to the large variation in caseload size, use of some sampling designs might mean that counselors or caseworkers with small caseloads may have no questionnaires to complete and some may have six or more. This uneven distribution could undermine this sort of research due to respondent fatigue for some--especially when we consider that each of the final questionnaires were 26 pages long and required on the average about an hour each to complete.

Lastly, it was necessary to have a sample of sufficient size. Given that we had estimated a population of about 10,000 to 11,000 juvenile court wards in Oregon, we wanted a sample large enough to provide population proportion (or percent) estimates with a reliability of $\pm$ 5 percent at the 95 percent confidence level. For example, if 50 percent of our sample had a certain problem or attribute, we would be sure or confident that in 95 of 100 chances the population from which we sampled would have had between 45 to 55 percent with that problem or attribute. For this sample reliability limit and confidence level, we needed a sample of at least 370 cases.

To solve our sampling problem, we elected to select a representative sample of 500 juvenile court wards.[1] In constructing this sample, we made one other decision--that we would limit the number of questionnaires to one or two per respondent and in no case more than three.

For the 4,174 cases named on the caseload "A" and "B" census forms as juvenile department supervised wards, we elected to select one from each counselor's caseload using a table of random numbers and for counselors with large caseloads of wards (i.e., over 46) we selected a second case using the same random number table.[2] This generated a juvenile department subsample of 196 cases for a ratio of roughly one in every 21 or 22 cases.

For the CSD subsample, we started with the list of 7,436 CSD cases on the caseload census Form C questionnaires completed by juvenile department staff and

---

[1]We selected the size 500 because of the possibility of a large number of nonreturns.

[2]Counselors identified as having intake only cases and pending wards were also included in the sample selection process.

two CSD IIS computer listings of cases indicated as CSD supervised wards. The first CSD listing was that produced for March 31, 1984 containing the 6,583 names mentioned earlier. The second was a late June 1984 listing of all wards (6,702) identified as of May 1984 and listed by caseload and county.

We then took the second computer listing with the more recent data (on who and where these wards were) and selected every 22nd name. We took these names into our sample only if they were also on the earlier March 31, 1984 listing, and we also attempted to verify if these names were among the 7,436 listed by the juvenile departments as CSD supervised wards on the caseload census "A" forms. Where any single CSD caseworker received three or more cases, we omitted all those beyond the second case in most instances and replaced these omitted cases by selecting the first case on the next listed caseworker's caseload or the last case on the previously listed caseworker's caseload. This resulted in a CSD subsample of 308 cases for a ratio of one in every 21 or 22 cases on the March 31, 1984 CSD listing of 6,583 wards.

While each of the two subsamples were generated in a somewhat different way--i.e., one by use of a random number table and one with a sequencing of roughly every 22nd case--we assume that our total sample (of 504 cases) is representative of the estimated population of all juvenile court wards in Oregon as of March 1984. At least given the exploratory nature of this research and the difficulties of doing such research, we feel that the sample is adequate for our purposes.

One last bit of information about the sampling remains to be revealed. This has to do with how many questionnaires were returned and how many were deemed usable for this study. The following table summarizes the appropriate data here:

	Juvenile Department Subsample	CSD Subsample	Total
Total Number of Questionnaires Sent Out	196	308	504
Total Number of Questionnaires Returned	183	297	480
Total Number of Questionnaires Judged Usable	172	270	442

Overall, 480 of 504 questionnaires sent out were returned for a percentage of 95.2 percent and 442 or 87.7 percent were deemed usable for the purposes of this research.[1]

THE RESULTS OF THE NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY ON A REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF JUVENILE COURT WARDS IN OREGON

As we mentioned earlier, the joint purposes of this research were to generate a data base which would be useful in answering key policy-research questions about the problems and needs of juvenile court wards identified in Oregon and to generate a preliminary report outlining their backgrounds, problems, and service needs, as well as discussing the nature and scope of the data base we have established. The first purpose or goal is a long term one and involves using this data base for several months and years to come. The second purpose is more immediate and is the subject of the remaining part of this report.

To organize and present our preliminary data analysis results and findings, we have arranged our discussion around an important set of questions. These questions and our results are outlined in the following narrative and corresponding tables. Besides this discussion, the reader should carefully review the contents of Appendix C of this report. This appendix contains a reproduction of the 24-page data collection instrument or questionnaire used in this study. Also included with this questionnaire in the far right hand column of each page, are what we refer to as "marginal frequencies." They tell the reader how many cases and what percentage of all cases fell into different categories of response for each question asked on this questionnaire. Occasionally, we also report other than percentage statistics--i.e., means and other summary statistics for frequency distributions on the different questions or items. Having introduced this important appendix, let's move on to our questions and the results or answers.

---

[1]The 38 questionnaires not considered usable included three returned too late to be included in the data analysis computer runs. The remainder were either incomplete (3 cases) or inappropriate. The inappropriate cases were those completed on juveniles who were not really current court wards. Some of these were cases where adjudication hearings were never held because the child's family consented to services of some kind and some were simply informal cases that were inappropriately included by juvenile department counselors on their caseload census A form questionnaires.

What Background or Demographic Characteristics Do Our Sample Court Wards Have and Are There Differences Between the Subsamples of Juvenile Department and CSD Supervised Cases?

Table 2 provides information on a number of questionnaire "face sheet" and demographic variables on the whole sample and the two previously identified subsamples. The highlights of this data are as follows:

1. As might be suspected, males outnumber females for the whole sample and especially for the juvenile department supervised wards. For the whole sample, 58.1 percent are males, with a larger percent (72.7%) for the juvenile department subsample. The CSD subsample, however, is only 48.9 percent male. In contrast in the 1980 Census in Oregon; 439,951 or 51.0 percent of the 861,870 persons under 21 years of age were male.[1]

2. A fairly large proportion of the court wards are Black (7.2%) and Hispanic (4.3%) in terms of ethnic or racial background and compared to the larger population of youth. These figures compare to the 1980 Census figures for 0-20 year olds of 1.8 percent Black (or 15,748 of 861,870) and 2.0 percent Hispanic (or 17,022 of 861,870).[2]

3. The average age of these wards was 13.4 years, with a lower average age for the CSD wards (12.1) and a higher average for the juvenile department wards (15.3).

4. For the remaining items in Table 2, it appears that the court wards:

   ...come from geographically mobile families (32.4% have been residents of their current county of residence for less than three years).

   ...live in families without both parents present (only 11.1% live in their own home with both parents).

   ...have natural parents who are divorced or separated for some reason (70.6%).

   ...have families with relatively low total yearly family income (38.7% were below $10,000).

   ...have many families currently or in the past receiving public assistance other than state payments for out-of-home care (44.6%).

---

[1]U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population, Volume 1, Characteristics of the Population, Oregon PC80-I-B39, U.S. G.P.O., 1981.

[2]Ibid., 1980 Census of Population.

Table 2

Frequency Distributions on Various Demographic and Other "Face Sheet" Variables for the Total Sample and the Juvenile Department and CSD Subsamples[a]

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
A. Sex			
Male	72.7%	48.9%	58.1%
Female	27.3%	51.1%	41.9%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
B. Racial/Ethnic Background			
White or Caucasian (non-Hispanic)	85.5%	78.9%	81.4%
Black, Negro, or Afro-American	5.2%	8.5%	7.2%
Hispanic, Chicano, or Spanish-speaking	5.2%	3.7%	4.3%
Oriental (Asian or Pacific Islander)	0.6%	1.5%	1.1%
(American) Indian	1.2%	4.4%	3.2%
Other, (specify)	1.7%	1.5%	1.6%
Unknown	0.6%	1.5%	1.1%
	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%
C. Age as of March 15, 1984			
Under 1 year old	0.0%	1.5%	0.9%
1 year old	0.6%	3.7%	2.5%
2 years old	0.6%	3.3%	2.3%
3 years old	1.2%	2.6%	2.0%
4 years old	1.2%	3.3%	2.5%
5 years old	0.6%	5.2%	3.4%
6 years old	0.0%	1.9%	1.1%
7 years old	0.0%	3.0%	1.8%
8 years old	1.2%	1.5%	1.4%
9 years old	1.7%	3.7%	2.9%
10 years old	0.6%	4.8%	3.2%
11 years old	1.2%	3.7%	2.7%
12 years old	2.3%	4.8%	3.8%
13 years old	5.2%	5.2%	5.2%
14 years old	15.1%	10.4%	12.2%
15 years old	22.1%	13.7%	17.0%
16 years old	18.0%	12.2%	14.5%
17 years old	22.1%	10.7%	15.2%
18 years old	5.2%	3.0%	3.8%
19 years old	1.2%	1.5%	1.4%
20 years old	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%
	100.1%	100.3%	100.0%
Average age in years	15.3	12.1	13.4
(Standard Deviation)	(3.1)	(5.2)	(4.8)
Median Age in years	15.9	14.2	15.1

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
D. County of Current Residence			
Baker	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Benton	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%
Clackamas	2.3%	4.8%	3.8%
Clatsop	1.2%	0.4%	0.7%
Columbia	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%
Coos	2.3%	1.5%	1.8%
Crook	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
Curry	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Deschutes	2.9%	1.9%	2.3%
Douglas	2.3%	3.7%	3.2%
Gilliam	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Grant	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Harney	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
Hood River	1.7%	0.7%	1.1%
Jackson	3.5%	3.7%	3.6%
Jefferson	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%
Josephine	1.2%	2.6%	2.0%
Klamath	2.3%	3.0%	2.7%
Lake	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
Lane	7.0%	6.3%	6.6%
Lincoln	2.3%	1.5%	1.8%
Linn	2.3%	1.9%	2.0%
Malheur	1.2%	1.9%	1.6%
Marion	15.7%	13.0%	14.0%
Morrow	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%
Multnomah	17.4%	24.1%	21.5%
Polk	3.5%	1.1%	2.0%
Sherman	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Tillamook	2.9%	1.1%	1.8%
Umatilla	0.6%	1.5%	1.1%
Union	1.2%	0.7%	0.9%
Wallowa	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Wasco	0.0%	2.2%	1.4%
Washington	8.1%	3.3%	5.2%
Wheeler	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Yamhill	1.7%	2.2%	2.0%
Out of State or Other (specify)	4.1%	7.8%	6.3%
Unknown	4.1%	4.1%	4.0%
	100.2%	100.2%	99.6%

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
E. How long (to the nearest whole year) has this individual been a resident of the above county?			
One year or less	15.1%	27.0%	22.4%
Two years	8.7%	10.7%	10.0%
Three years	2.9%	4.4%	3.8%
Four years	6.4%	5.2%	5.7%
Five years	2.9%	4.4%	3.8%
Six years	3.5%	1.5%	2.3%
Seven years	3.5%	3.0%	3.2%
Eight years or more	47.1%	34.1%	39.1%
Unknown	9.9%	9.7%	9.7%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
F. Area in Which Child Currently Resides:			
In a large city (over 250,000)	16.3%	21.9%	19.7%
In a medium size city (50,000-250,000)	14.5%	14.1%	14.3%
In a small city or town (under 50,000)	43.0%	37.4%	39.6%
In a suburb near a city	3.5%	5.9%	5.0%
On a farm or ranch	1.2%	4.4%	3.2%
In open country but not farm/ranch	10.5%	8.5%	9.3%
Other, (specify)	2.9%	1.1%	1.8%
Unknown	8.2%	6.6%	7.3%
	100.1%	99.9%	100.2%
G. Current Living Arrangement of Child:			
In own home:			
With both parents	21.5%	4.4%	11.1%
With mother & stepfather	9.9%	5.2%	7.0%
With father & stepmother	2.9%	3.7%	3.4%
With mother only	29.7%	18.5%	22.9%
With father only	2.9%	3.0%	2.9%
In home of relatives	2.9%	11.9%	8.4%
In foster family home	6.4%	25.2%	17.9%
In institution (specify)	9.3%	13.0%	11.5%
In independent living arrangements	2.9%	1.9%	2.3%
In other place (specify)	5.8%	8.9%	7.7%
Unknown	5.8%	4.4%	4.9%
	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
H. Current Marital Status of Natural Parents:			
Parents married and living together	29.1%	10.7%	17.9%
One or both parents dead:			
Both dead	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%
Father dead	2.3%	4.1%	3.4%
Mother dead	3.5	3.0%	3.2%
Parents separated:			
Divorced or legally separated	50.0%	52.6%	51.6%
Father deserted mother	2.9%	3.7%	3.4%
Mother deserted father	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%
Other reason (specify)	0.6%	3.0%	2.0%
Parents not married to each other	6.4%	14.8%	11.5%
Other status (specify)	0.6%	1.9%	1.4%
Unknown	3.5%	5.2%	4.5%
	100.1%	100.1%	100.1%
I. Which of the following categories represents the "best estimate" of this child's family's total yearly income?			
$2,999 or less	1.2%	13.0%	8.4%
$3,000 - $5,999	8.1%	15.9%	12.9%
$6,000 - $9,999	18.0%	17.0%	17.4%
$10,000 - $14,999	16.9%	17.4%	17.2%
$15,000 - $24,999	16.9%	10.7%	13.1%
$25,000 - $49,999	13.4%	7.0%	9.5%
$50,000 or more	1.7%	0.4%	0.9%
Other (specify)	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Unknown	22.7%	18.5%	20.2%
	100.1%	99.9%	101.1%
J. Is this child's family currently receiving public assistance (other than state payments for out-of-home care or institutionalization)?			
Yes	13.4%	22.2%	18.8%
No, but did in past	16.9%	31.5%	25.8%
No, never	39.5%	26.3%	31.4%
Other (specify)	4.1%	2.2%	2.9%
Unknown	26.2%	17.8%	21.0%
	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
K. Child's Current School Student Status:			
Full time	56.4%	63.7%	60.9%
Part time	5.8%	1.9%	3.4%
Suspended	1.7%	0.7%	1.1%
Expelled	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Discontinued, no diploma or GED awarded	12.2%	8.9%	10.2%
Discontinued, graduated from high school	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%
Discontinued, GED awarded	4.1%	3.0%	3.4%
Other, specify	7.6%	16.3%	12.9%
Unknown	8.7%	3.3%	5.4%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%
L. Child's Current Employment Status:			
Not employed	52.9%	78.1%	68.3%
Employed full time	3.5%	1.9%	2.5%
Employed part time	21.5%	9.3%	14.0%
Other (specify)	8.1%	6.3%	7.0%
Unknown	14.0%	4.4%	8.2%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
M. Child's Current School Type:			
Regular school/mainstream	43.0%	39.6%	41.0%
Regular school/special education	11.6%	15.6%	14.0%
Regular school/vocational education	0.6%	1.1%	0.9%
Alternative school program	4.7%	5.2%	5.0%
Vocational or trade school	1.2%	1.5%	1.4%
Day treatment program (mental health)	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%
GED program	6.4%	2.6%	4.1%
Other (specify)	16.9%	25.9%	22.4%
Unknown	15.7%	7.0%	10.6%
	100.1%	99.6%	100.1%

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
N. Highest Grade Completed			
Kindergarten only or none at all.	3.5%	20.7%	14.0%
First grade	0.0%	1.5%	0.9%
Second grade.	1.7%	1.9%	1.8%
Third grade	0.6%	3.0%	2.0%
Fourth grade.	1.7%	4.1%	3.2%
Fifth grade	0.6%	4.1%	2.7%
Sixth grade	2.3%	4.8%	3.8%
Seventh grade	6.4%	7.4%	7.0%
Eighth grade.	15.7%	13.0%	14.0%
Ninth grade	20.3%	12.6%	15.6%
Tenth grade	23.8%	9.6%	15.2%
Eleventh grade.	12.2%	10.0%	10.9%
Twelfth grade (or more)	6.4%	4.1%	5.0%
Unknown	4.7%	3.4%	3.8%
	99.9%	100.2%	99.9%
O. Current School Grade Placement in Relation to Age:			
Retarded.	11.6%	13.3%	12.7%
At Expected Level	57.6%	53.3%	55.0%
Accelerated	0.6%	1.1%	0.9%
Inapplicable (not in school).	16.3%	19.6%	18.3%
Other (specify)	4.7%	5.6%	5.2%
Unknown	9.3%	7.1%	7.9%
	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%

[a]Please note that percentages do not always total 100.0 percent due to rounding errors and that "missing values" are combined with "unknowns."

What Were the Reasons for These Wards' Current Juvenile Court Status?

Table 3 provides information on a number of items which describe the basis for these wards' current juvenile court status. Highlights from this table can be listed as follows:

1. Very few of these wards were transferred into Oregon from out-of-state (only 2.3%).
2. Very few of these wards had violent personal crimes listed as the most serious offenses which were adjudicated and resulted in the current wardship status (only 1.6% had violent UCR Index crimes[1] listed and the only other violent crimes listed were 0.2 percent for manslaughter by negligence and 2.7 percent for simple assault).
3. The most frequent crimes listed as the most serious crimes resulting in wardship were burglary (14.5%) and abuse/neglect (37.1%).
4. Roughly one-third (33.0%) had a most serious wardship crime which could be classified a felony.
5. Placement with CSD for custody, care, and control was a part of the final custody decision (before the most current wardship) for 60.2 percent of the sample.

In examining the results in Table 3, it is important to note certain significant differences between the juvenile department supervised court wards and those supervised by CSD. CSD wards are more apt to be "dependency" and abuse/neglect cases and less likely to have been made court wards because of felony crimes and property crimes such as burglary or larceny.

---

[1]Violent UCR (Uniform Crime Reporting) Index crimes include criminal homicide (i.e., murder and non-negligent manslaughter), forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution on Variables Reflecting Current Juvenile Court Status for the Total Sample and the Juvenile Department and CSD Subsamples[a]

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
A. Was this child made a court ward in another state and transferred to Oregon via the Interstate Compact?			
Yes	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%
No.	96.5%	97.0%	96.8%
Unknown	1.2%	0.7%	0.9%
	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%
B. What was the most serious offense or petition complaint which was substantiated or proved in the adjudication hearing which resulted in the child's current (or pending) juvenile court jurisdiction/wardship?			
Offenses applicable to both juveniles and adults (excluding traffic)			
Murder & non-negligent manslaughter	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Manslaughter by negligence.	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
Forcible rape	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
Robbery: Purse snatching by force	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Robbery: All except purse snatching	2.3%	0.7%	1.4%
Assault: Aggravated (1st-3rd degree).	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Assault: All except aggravated.	3.5%	2.2%	2.7%
Burglary-breaking or entering	25.6%	7.4%	14.5%
Auto theft: Unauthorized use.	6.4%	1.9%	3.6%
Auto theft: All except unauthorized use	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Larceny: Shoplifting.	8.7%	0.7%	3.8%
Larceny: All except Shoplifting	9.9%	3.7%	6.1%
Weapon carrying, possessing, etc.	1.2%	0.4%	0.7%
Sex offenses (except forcible rape)	2.3%	4.8%	3.8%
Violation of drug laws: Narcotic.	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%
Violation of drug laws: All but Narcotic.	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Drunkenness	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Disorderly conduct.	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Vandalism	6.4%	0.4%	2.7%
Arson	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%
Other delinquent (specify).	10.5%	6.3%	7.9%

Table 3 (Cont'd.)

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
B. (Continued)			
Offenses applicable to juveniles only (excluding traffic)			
Running away	0.6%	4.8%	3.2%
Truancy	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Violation of curfew	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ungovernable behavior	2.3%	5.2%	4.1%
Possessing or drinking of liquor	2.9%	0.4%	1.4%
Other status (specify)	0.0%	1.5%	0.9%
Traffic offenses			
Driving while intoxicated (DWI or DUII)	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Hit and run	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Reckless driving	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Driving without a license (including DWS or driving while suspended)	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
All other traffic (specify)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Neglect (abuse, desertion, inadequate care, etc.)			
Abuse	4.7%	20.0%	14.0%
All other neglect	5.8%	34.1%	23.1%
Unknown	1.8%	3.3%	2.6%
	100.3%	100.0%	100.0%
C. How would you classify the type of offense or reason cited in "B" above?			
Criminal (or delinquent) act: against the person	14.0%	18.1%	16.5%
Criminal (or delinquent) act: against property	64.5%	15.6%	34.6%
Criminal (or delinquent) act: against statute, (specify)	2.9%	0.7%	1.6%
Noncriminal: status offense	5.85	8.5%	7.5%
Noncriminal: dependency, abuse, and/or neglect	11.0%	49.6%	34.6%
Traffic violation	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Fishing/boating/game law violations	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other (specify)	0.0%	4.1%	2.5%
Unknown (don't know)	0.6%	3.3%	2.3%
	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%

Table 3 (Cont'd.)

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
D. If the petition offense or complaint in Item #19 (above) is considered a criminal (or delinquent) act, can it be classified as a felony?			
Does not apply, not classified a delinquent or criminal act	15.1%	47.8%	35.1%
Yes (a felony)	51.2%	21.5%	33.0%
No (not a felony)	31.4%	21.8%	25.6%
Uncertain or can't ascertain (not enough information)	0.6%	3.0%	2.0%
Unknown	1.7%	5.9%	4.3%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
E. If you indicated that a disposition of this case has occurred (in "B" above), what specifically was the first (or primary) disposition which resulted from this disposition (i.e., from the substantiated complaint)?			
Not applicable, disposition hearing still pending	2.3%	3.3%	2.9%
No transfer of legal custody:			
Juvenile court probation officer to supervise	66.3%	5.6%	29.2%
Referred to another agency or individual for supervision (specify)	4.7%	4.1%	4.3%
Runaway returned to:_____	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
Other (specify):_____	5.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Transfer of legal custody to:			
CSD-caseworker to supervise	8.1%	65.9%	43.4%
CSD-state training school or other public institution for delinquents (specify)	2.3%	4.8%	3.8%
Other CSD (specify)	2.3%	5.2%	4.1%
Other public institution (specify)	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
Public agency or department (including court) (specify)	4.7%	0.0%	1.8%
Private agency or institution (specify)	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
Individual (specify)	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%
Other (specify)	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%
Legal custody unknown:			
Other (specify)	1.2%	0.0%	0.5%
Unknown	1.7%	3.7%	2.9%
	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%

Table 3 (Cont'd.)

	Juvenile Department Cases (N=172)	CSD Cases (N=270)	Total Sample (N=442)
F. Was placement with CSD for custody, care and control a part of the final custody decision (in "B" above)?			
Not applicable, disposition hearing still pending.	5.8%	2.6%	3.8%
Yes	24.4%	83.0%	60.2%
No.	66.3%	12.6%	33.5%
Unknown	3.5%	1.9%	2.5%
	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%

[a]Please note that percentages do not always total 100.0 percent due to rounding errors and that "missing values" are combined with "unknowns."

Note to The Reader:

In the remaining sections of this report, we have not included specific breakdowns between the juvenile department and CSD wards. However, these are available on request for interested readers. Rather than focus on CSD vs. non-CSD differences, our purpose is to provide a statement about the needs of all court wards. Later, we will want to examine--perhaps in a separate report--specific differences between these subsamples. From the data presented so far, it would certainly appear that there are notable differences between these groupings and that they have to be taken into account in our eventual analyses of the needs of specific groups of juvenile court wards in Oregon.

What is Unique About the Juvenile Court Referral History of These Juvenile Court Wards?

In reviewing pages six through eight of Appendix C, it appears that these juvenile court wards have a fairly extensive and serious juvenile court referral history behind them. The highlighted findings would have to include the following:

1. Slightly over half of the wards (50.7%) were first made wards due to or as a result of a series of acts (or behaviors) which required court supervision and/or intervention.

2. On the average, these wards collectively had 3.1 prior juvenile court contacts or referrals (before their current wardship).

3. The most serious juvenile court dispositions experienced by these wards included the following:

   ..."pre-adjudication" detention (16.3%)

   ...out-of-home care placement (43.9%)

   ...training school commitment for a past referral (7.7%)

   ...remand (excluding "blanket" remands) to an adult criminal court for case processing (0.2%)

4. In reviewing these wards' first known (or documented) juvenile court referral anywhere, the most serious referral reason or complaint distributed as follows:

   ...violent UCR Index crime (4.2%)

   ...burglary (12.0%)

   ...larceny or shoplifting (8.2%)

   ...abuse or neglect (32.6%)

What Problems in the Client Profiles of These Wards Are Related to Their Current Juvenile Court Status or Prior Referral History and Consequently to Their Current Service Needs?

Page 9 in Appendix C contains the data for answering this question. Again, certain findings need to be highlighted. Several problems were considered salient or strong factors in the child's current needs for JJS services and treatment:

...danger to self or others (37.6%)

...chronic juvenile court involvement (18.8%)

...committing offenses in an aggressive, violent, premeditated and/or willful manner (21.0%)

...amenability to treatment (38.9%)

...chronic runaway episodes (15.1%)

...evidence of parental or adult sexual abuse (20.8%)

...evidence of parental or adult physical abuse (29.2%)

...evidence of other forms of child neglect (43.2%)

...evidence that offense involvement (criminal or status) resulted from some form of drug abuse (18.3%)

...evidence that offense involvement (criminal or status) resulted from some form of alcohol abuse (17.6%)

...evidence of "escalation" of offenses and severity (24.4%)

It is important to point out that of the fifteen (15) problems listed, these wards had an overall average of 3.2 problems. The frequency distribution by number of cited problems is as follows:

Number of Problems	Frequency	Percent of Total	Number of Problems	Frequency	Percent of Total
0	24	5.4%	8	20	4.5%
1	112	25.3%	9	10	2.3%
2	79	17.9%	10	4	0.9%
3	71	16.1%	11	3	0.7%
4	42	9.5%	12	0	0.0%
5	36	8.1%	13	1	0.2%
6	24	5.4%	14	0	0.0%
7	16	3.6%	15	0	0.0%
				442	99.9%

Is This Child Currently in Danger of Abuse, Neglect, or Exploitation?

On page 11 of Appendix C, we see that the counselors and caseworkers were asked to determine in their professional judgement whether or not the child was currently in imminent physical danger or in emotional (or mental) danger. As the frequency distribution indicates, 12.5 percent of these wards (or 55 cases) were rated as being in current situations of imminent physical danger. These 55 cases distributed across the response categories as follows:

Child in imminent physical danger of:

...physical abuse (1.1%)
...sexual abuse (3.6%)
...abandonment (0.5%)
...neglect (1.4%)
...inadequate parenting (4.1%)
..."other" physical danger (1.8%)

In addition, another 14.7 percent (or 65 cases) were rated as being in current situations of emotional or mental danger. These 65 cases distributed across the response categories as follows:

Child in emotional or mental danger due to:

...inadequate parenting (7.7%)
...parents unable to carry out normal parenting role (2.0%)
...parents cannot cope with child's developmental disability (0.2%)
...parents cannot cope with child's mental disability (0.7%)
...parents cannot cope with child's emotional disability (1.6%)
...some other situation or condition (2.5%)

Was This Child Ever in the Past in Danger of Abuse, Neglect or Exploitation?

Surprisingly, the data at the bottom of page 11 in Appendix C indicates that only 19.9 percent of these wards (or 88 cases) were rated as never being in the past in situations of imminent physical danger or of emotional or mental danger. Over half of all these 442 wards or 54.9 percent (243 cases) were rated as being at one time in the past in imminent physical danger. In addition, another 17.3 percent (or 76 cases) were rated as being in the past in situations of emotional or mental danger.

What Individual Problems Were These Wards Rated as Presenting the JJS and Its Service Delivery System?

As indicated on page 12 of Appendix C, these wards are very apt to have some level of presenting problems in the following areas:

...substance abuse - drugs (37.6%)
...substance abuse - alcohol (38.3%)
...poor self-esteem (72.6%)
...difficulty relating to peers (62.9%)
...difficulty relating to adults (68.1%)
...inadequate internal control (70.4%)

Since each of the individual or personal problems listed on page 12 of Appendix C are ranked as to level of severity ("1 for a very mild problem" to "5 for a very serious problem"), it is possible to get a 13-problem severity score total for each individual, and an average score for the group of all wards taken as a whole. For all 442 wards, the average individual problem severity score was 15.6. This average takes into account 61 individuals not having any of these 13 problems and the remainder having between 1 and 13 problems with a total severity score ranging from 1 to 50.

Do These Wards Present the JJS With Significant Presenting Problems in the Areas of the Family, the School and the Community?

As indicated on pages 13 through 15 in Appendix C, these wards are very apt to have some level of JJS presenting problems in the following areas and sub-areas:

Family Problems

...inadequate level of parental involvement in child's life (77.8%)
...dysfunctional parents (69.9%)
...inconsistent/inadequate parental discipline (78.7%)
...verbal antagonism toward parents and other family adults (57.0%)

School Problems

...diagnosed learning disabilities (26.0%)
...poor academic performance (41.6%)
...truancy/poor attendance (46.4%)
...verbally antagonistic toward teachers/other school adults (38.9%)
...verbally antagonistic toward classmates/other children (39.4%)

Community Problems

...involvement with delinquent peers or gang members (33.7%)
...engages in stealing in the community (44.8%)
...involved in vandalism (21.7%)

As with the individual problems, the 11 family problems, the 11 school problems, and the 11 community problems rated by counselors; each generate a total severity score for each individual and these can be averaged for the total group. These averages and related statistics can be summarized as follows for these 442 court wards:

Problem Type	No. Having None of These Problems	Range of Scores	Sample Average (N-442)
Family	36	0-48	17.7
School	133	0-50	9.3
Community	162	0-41	5.7

In looking at the above results, it is interesting and meaningful that these problems have a sort of "radial" pattern. That is, it appears that the severity levels of each of the group of listed problems seems to load or weigh most heavily toward the family dimension and radiate out in less severe fashion to the school and then to the community. This is a significant finding when we consider that treatment approaches often begin with a community focus; then a school focus; and finally, a family focus. Where problems may appear to "bubble out" or spread from the family to the school and then the community; services flow in the opposite direction. In other words, we first appear to treat kids in the community; we eventually get to the school; and last we tackle the "tough nut" of solving family problems.

This finding and its implications are worth additional analysis and elaboration in some additional research using these data.

What Treatment Settings Do These Wards Need?

As indicated on Page 16 of Appendix C, only about half of these wards (51.6%) are currently placed in their own homes and an even smaller percentage ideally should remain there (43.4%). Also, only 42.1 percent are likely to remain home given current resources for future use.

The contrast between current and ideal placement settings for these wards is also an important subject for analysis. Table 4 presents the necessary data.

Table 4

Current vs. Ideal Service/Treatment Settings for Juvenile Court Wards
(Percentages are of Total or 442)

		Ideal Setting				
		Own Home	Out-of Home Care	Other	Unknown	Row Totals
Current Setting	Own Home	(173) 39.1%	(40) 9.0%	(13) 2.9%	(2) 0.5%	(228) 51.6%
	Out-of-Home Care	(13) 2.9%	(124) 28.1%	(11) 2.5%	(3) 0.7%	(151) 34.2%
	Other	(5) 1.1%	(13) 2.9%	(31) 7.0%	(3) 0.7%	(52) 11.8%
	Unknown	(1) 0.2%	(5) 1.1%	(0) 0.0%	(5) 1.1%	(11) 2.5%
	Total	(192) 43.4%	(182) 41.2%	(55) 12.4%	(13) 2.9%	(442) 100.0%

Of the 228 wards currently placed in their own homes, 173 (or 75.9%) should ideally remain there. Of the 151 currently in out-of-home care settings, 124

(or 82.1%) should ideally remain in such settings. These figures indicate that a fairly sizeable number of wards are ideally placed in their own homes or in out-of-home care settings, respectively.

Figures on page 16 of Appendix C indicate more specific data on the kinds of current and ideal out-of-home care settings. Also, page 17 of Appendix C provides more information on specific types of settings.

Is Removal From the Child's Own Home a Mandatory Aspect or Requirement For an Ideal Service Treatment Setting for This Child?

At the top of page 17 in Appendix C, we see that Item #47 addresses this question. The results may or may not be surprising to the reader depending on his or her perspective. Nearly half (47.7%) of these wards were judged as candidates for home removal. That is, an ideal service setting for a large portion of these cases would be some form of out-of-home care rather than their own homes.

This finding is surprising in light of all the recent talk in the JJS of reducing the use of expensive out-of-home care options and "downsizing" institutions in favor of using more community-based alternatives and keeping children in their own homes. The same finding is not surprising, however, when we consider the nature and severity of the home and family problems of these same juvenile court wards.

What Services Do These Wards Currently Need and How Adequate Are The Level of Services Being Received?

The data on pages 18 through 20 of Appendix C provide summaries of how many wards need each of several specific "primary" and "secondary" services. The data provide at this stage a summary of need. More specific analyses must be done of why some wards are not receiving such services and how adequate such services are for these wards. A good start in this direction is afforded by examining on pages 18 through 20 in Appendix C the frequency distributions for the specific responses to each of the seven (7) rated primary services and the nineteen (19) rated secondary services. Using the "a through z" listing of services and the "0 through 9" response codes, we can array our data as follows in Table 5:

Table 5

Percent of Current Court Wards Needing Particular Services and Receiving an Adequate Level by Type of Service Rated

(Percentages based on the total sample of 442 court wards)

Primary Services	Does Not Apply (Service Not Needed by This Child) 0	Service Needed But Not Available in This Locale 1	Service Needed But Not Provided Because of Waiting List 2	Service Needed But Not Provided Because of Funding Problems 3	Service Needed and Provided However Level and/or Quality is Inadequate for Child's Needs 4	Service Needed and Provided and Level and/or Quality is Adequate to Meet Child's Needs 5	Child Not Available to Receive Services 8	Unknown 9
a. Out-of-Home Care[1]	52.3%	3.4%	1.6%	0.9%	4.1%	29.6%	0.2%	7.9%
b. Institutionalization[2]	78.5%	2.0%	1.4%	0.2%	2.0%	7.2%	0.0%	8.6%
c. Mental Hlth. Day Care	82.4%	1.4%	0.5%	1.1%	0.9%	3.8%	0.2%	9.7%
d. School/School Related	42.1%	3.6%	1.6%	1.8%	5.7%	33.9%	0.2%	11.1%
e. Juv. Dept. Probation/Super.	62.9%	1.4%	0.0%	0.2%	4.5%	22.2%	0.2%	8.6%
f. Post Adjudication Detention	86.0%	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	8.8%
g. Other	62.7%	1.6%	0.0%	1.1%	1.4%	5.0%	0.0%	28.3%
Secondary Services								
h. Psychological/Psychiatric Eval.	63.6%	1.6%	0.5%	6.1%	3.2%	17.2%	0.5%	7.5%
i. Individual Counseling	39.8%	3.2%	1.1%	4.3%	7.0%	36.0%	0.5%	8.1%
j. Group Counseling	60.2%	3.2%	1.6%	2.9%	2.7%	20.1%	0.7%	8.6%
k. Family Counseling	51.4%	4.8%	1.1%	2.9%	8.8%	21.3%	0.7%	9.0%
l. Alcohol Abuse Treatment	77.8%	2.0%	0.2%	0.9%	2.9%	6.1%	0.5%	9.5%
m. Drug/Substance Abuse Treatment	75.8%	2.5%	0.5%	1.4%	3.4%	7.0%	0.5%	9.0%
n. Employment Training	69.0%	2.7%	1.1%	4.3%	5.0%	7.2%	0.5%	10.2%
o. Protective Services	78.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	12.4%	0.5%	6.8%
p. Education/GED	61.8%	0.9%	0.5%	1.8%	4.3%	22.6%	0.2%	7.9%
q. Recreation Programs	68.8%	2.7%	1.1%	2.0%	1.4%	14.9%	0.0%	9.0%
r. Play/Art Therapy	81.2%	1.6%	0.9%	1.8%	0.9%	4.1%	0.0%	9.5%
s. Big Brother/Sister Programs	82.6%	4.1%	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%	1.6%	0.0%	9.3%
t. Restitution	75.8%	1.8%	0.9%	0.5%	1.4%	12.7%	0.2%	6.8%
u. Special Education	64.7%	0.7%	1.1%	0.5%	4.1%	19.2%	0.2%	9.5%
v. Parenting Education	61.5%	6.6%	0.9%	2.3%	5.2%	10.6%	0.2%	12.7%
w. Supportive Services (Homemaker Housekeeper, etc.)	81.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%	1.6%	5.7%	0.0%	8.6%
x. Medical/Dental Treatment	52.0%	0.5%	0.0%	2.3%	2.9%	26.2%	0.0%	16.1%
y. Other Counseling and/or Case Management Services	64.3%	2.5%	0.5%	2.0%	1.8%	12.4%	0.2%	16.3%
z. Other	69.7%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	1.1%	0.9%	0.0%	26.7%

[1] Out-of-home care is defined as foster care, group home or residential treatment facilities (youth care centers and private agencies).

[2] Institutionalization is defined as training school commitment or state hospital care.

These data (in Table 5) reveal a large variation in the proportion of all wards needing particular services and some notable variation in both the availability of services needed and the adequacy of services actually received. Of particular interest in Table 5 are the percentage figures arrayed in the code "1" to code "5" columns. As these percentages are all based on the total of 442 court wards in our sample, one can compute the number of clients corresponding to any percentage.

Inspection of the data in Appendix C can further reveal important information about service needs and service availability. In examining pages 18 through 20 in Appendix C, we can see that when we collapse codes 1 through 5 we have for each service the proportion or percent of all wards needing a service. Scanning down the far right column of each of these pages, we can see that some services are more often needed than others. Among primary services, school-related programs are most often needed (46.6%) whereas post-adjudication detention is least needed (5.2%). For secondary services, individual counseling most often is needed (51.6%) and "other" non- specified services were needed least often (3.6%).

Apart from the level of need is the issue of how many wards needing a service actually receive that service and are adequately served (i.e., receive services at a level adequate for their needs). Perhaps the best way to examine data on unmet needs is to collapse response codes and determine for each type of primary or secondary service how many wards were rated as needing the service (codes 1 through 5) and of these how many were rated as receiving these services at a level adequate for their needs (code 5). The data arrayed on the following page provides information on the total number of wards rated as needing a service and of this number what number (and percent) actually were receiving this service at a level adequate for meeting their needs.

	Number Needing the Service	Number Receiving Adequate Level of Service	Percent of Need Met
Primary Services			
a. Out-of-home care--except institutionalization	175	131	74.9%
b. Institutionalization	57	32	56.1%
c. Mental health day care/other day care	34	17	50.0%
d. School or school-related program	206	150	72.8%
e. Intensive/regular juv.ct. probation supervision	125	98	78.4%
f. Detention (post-adjudication)	23	19	82.6%
g. Other	40	22	55.0%
Secondary Services			
h. Psychiatric/psychological assess. and/or treat.	126	76	60.3%
i. Individual counseling	228	159	69.7%
j. Group counseling	135	89	65.9%
k. Family counseling	172	94	54.7%
l. Alcohol abuse treatment services	54	27	50.0%
m. Drug/substance abuse treatment services	65	31	47.7%
n. Employment training and/or placement (including vocational training)	90	32	35.6%
o. Protective services	64	55	85.9%
p. Education/GED preparation/tutoring	133	100	75.2%
q. Recreation program and/or therapy	98	66	67.3%
r. Play and art therapy	41	18	43.9%
s. Big brother/big sister kinship program	36	7	19.4%
t. Restitution/community service program	76	56	73.7%
u. Special education program (including alternative education program)	113	85	75.2%
v. Parenting education/parent effectiveness train.	113	47	41.6%
w. Supportive services (homemaker or housekeeper) and/or transportation	43	25	58.1%
x. Medical/dental treatment	141	116	82.3%
y. Other counseling and/or case management program	85	55	64.7%
z. Other	16	4	25.0%

In reviewing the above data, we can see that among primary services the greatest unmet needs are for mental health and nonmental health day care (50%). The primary service needs most often satisfied were for the wards needing post-adjudication detention (82.6%). Among secondary services, the greatest unmet need was for big brother or big sister kinship programs (19.4%). The most often met secondary need was for protective services (85.9%).

More detail in rated service needs and level of service being received is possible by dividing our total sample into several subsamples. Three (3) subsamples are of interest to us at this point. These are delinquents, status offenders and "dependency" wards (the latter being those children determined to be neglected, abused, or dependents requiring juvenile court and dependent services).[1] Table 6 provides a breakdown of these three groupings in type of rated service need. This table provides the best information in this report on what services the various categories of court wards are rated as needing and the proportions of those with each service need who are rated as receiving an adequate level of service (or as having the need met).

As an example of how to read this table, take the case of the delinquent wards needing secondary service "S" or a big brother/big sister program. Of 233 delinquency wards, only 25 (or 10.7% of the 233) were rated as needing this service. However, of these 25 wards with the need, only 6 (or 24.0% of the 25) were rated as having this service provided at a level which was adequate to meet their needs.

Were New Primary and Secondary Services Needed by These Wards?

On page 20 of Appendix C, we can see that some respondents felt that these wards (at least some of them) required either new primary services (17.0%) or new secondary services (16.1%). The specific nature of these new services requires additional analyses--specifically a content analysis of what respondents wrote or specified on the questionnaires themselves.

---

1 The delinquent, status offender, and dependency wards were determined from breakdowns on item #20 on page 4 of the questionnaire.

Table 6

Number and Percent of Current Court Wards Needing Particular Services and Receiving an Adequate Level of Service by Type of Wardship and by Type of Service Rated

	Delinquents				Status Offenders				Dependency Cases				Total Sample[1]			
	Number With Need	Percent of Sub-Total (N=233)	Number With Adequate Level of Service	Percent of Need Met	Number With Need	Percent of Sub-Total (N=33)	Number With Adequate Level of Service	Percent of Need Met	Number With Need	Percent of Sub-Total (N=153)	Number With Adequate Level of Service	Percent of Need Met	Number With Need	Percent of Total (N=442)	Number With Adequate Level of Service	Percent of Need Met
PRIMARY SERVICES																
a. Out-of-Home Care	77	33.0%	47	61.0%	13	39.4%	8	61.5%	73	47.7%	64	87.7%	175	39.6%	131	74.9%
b. Institutionalization	39	16.7%	22	56.4%	11	33.3%	8	72.7%	7	4.6%	2	28.6%	57	12.9%	32	56.1%
c. Day Care	16	6.9%	6	37.5%	1	3.0%	1	100.0%	17	11.1%	10	58.8%	34	7.7%	17	50.0%
d. School-Related Program	118	50.6%	80	67.8%	16	48.5%	14	87.5%	64	41.8%	48	75.0%	206	46.6%	150	72.8%
e. Intensive Probation	108	46.4%	83	76.9%	4	12.1%	3	75.0%	11	7.2%	10	90.9%	125	28.3%	98	78.4%
f. Detention (Post-Adj.)	23	9.9%	19	82.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	5.2%	19	82.6%
g. Other (Specify)	24	10.3%	11	45.8%	3	9.1%	2	66.7%	13	8.5%	9	69.2%	40	9.0%	22	55.0%
SECONDARY SERVICES																
h. Psych. Treatment	76	32.6%	42	55.3%	11	33.3%	8	72.7%	37	24.2%	24	64.9%	126	28.5%	76	60.3%
i. Indiv. Counseling	140	60.1%	98	70.0%	23	69.7%	19	82.6%	61	39.9%	38	62.3%	228	51.6%	159	69.7%
j. Group Counseling	90	38.6%	58	64.4%	16	48.5%	13	81.3%	28	18.3%	17	60.7%	135	30.5%	89	65.9%
k. Family Counseling	104	44.6%	55	52.9%	15	45.5%	8	53.3%	48	31.4%	27	56.3%	172	38.9%	94	54.7%
l. Alcohol Abuse Treat.	39	16.7%	17	43.6%	9	27.3%	7	77.8%	3	2.0%	1	33.3%	54	12.2%	27	50.0%
m. Drug Abuse Treat.	49	21.0%	23	46.9%	11	33.3%	6	54.5%	4	2.6%	2	50.0%	65	14.7%	31	47.7%
n. Employment Training	64	27.5%	16	25.0%	10	30.3%	6	60.0%	15	9.8%	9	60.0%	90	20.4%	32	35.6%
o. Protective Services	23	9.9%	20	87.0%	2	6.1%	2	100.0%	34	22.2%	29	85.3%	64	14.5%	55	85.9%
p. Educ./GED Tutoring	92	39.5%	66	71.7%	12	36.4%	10	83.3%	27	17.6%	22	81.5%	133	30.1%	100	75.2%
q. Recreation Therapy	63	27.0%	40	63.5%	13	39.4%	10	76.9%	20	13.1%	14	70.0%	98	22.2%	66	67.3%
r. Play and Art Therapy	21	9.0%	11	52.4%	1	3.0%	1	100.0%	17	11.1%	4	23.5%	41	9.3%	18	43.9%
s. Big Brother/Sister	25	10.7%	6	24.0%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%	8	5.2%	1	12.5%	36	8.1%	7	19.4%
t. Restitution	75	32.2%	55	73.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	1	100.0%	76	17.2%	56	73.7%
u. Special Education	67	28.8%	47	70.1%	8	24.2%	8	100.0%	35	22.9%	27	77.1%	113	25.6%	85	75.2%
v. Parent Training	69	29.6%	26	37.7%	6	18.2%	2	33.3%	35	22.9%	17	48.6%	113	25.6%	47	41.6%
w. Home Services	15	6.4%	6	40.0%	2	6.1%	1	50.0%	24	15.7%	16	66.7%	43	9.7%	25	58.1%
x. Medical/Dental	59	25.3%	46	78.0%	11	33.3%	10	90.9%	61	39.9%	52	85.2%	141	31.9%	116	82.3%
y. Other Counseling	44	18.9%	25	56.8%	10	30.3%	9	90.0%	27	17.6%	17	63.0%	85	19.2%	55	64.7%
z. Other (Specify)	5	2.1%	0	0.0%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%	9	5.9%	3	33.3%	16	3.6%	4	25.0%

[1] The sample total of 442 includes 23 cases where the type of current wardship status was either "other" or "unknown."

What Other Information Is Available on These Juvenile Court Wards?

Additional information on these wards is provided on pages 20 through 24 of Appendix C. Information included pertains to the following:

...the likelihood of developing realistic case plans to meet short and long term rehabilitation goals.

...client assets which would aid rehabilitation efforts.

...client and significant other cooperation ratings.

...ratings of the risk of future involvement in various types of delinquent acts and other behaviors.

...additional comments not included on this questionnaire form or in this study.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM THE PRELIMINARY DATA ANALYSES AND WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE

In this last section of the report, we are concerned with "bottom lines" about what these data tell us and what additional research we ought to do on this very intriguing data set.

Our purposes in this report have been to present descriptive information on the results of the overall study and to outline the richness of the data base--particularly its usefulness for generating important inferences about the problems and needs of subgroups of juvenile court wards in Oregon.

The preliminary results indicate that wards are certainly a diverse group with substantial variation in presenting problems and service needs. Particularly surprising are the large numbers of wards with extensive family problems. One almost wonders if these children have "bankrupted" already limited family resources to deal with their problems. This extensive family problem history seems to help explain the large number of wards rated as requiring out-of-home care placements and related family-centered services.

The next steps in any future research ought to be focused on attempting to describe the problems and service needs of particular subgroups of wards--especially the following:

...those rated as requiring out-of-home care placements.

...those with CSO as opposed to juvenile court case management supervision.

...those with previous out-of-home care experience and/or training school commitment status.

...those with other significant statuses or backgrounds--such as dependency wardship and chronic juvenile court referral histories.

The most important use of this data base, however, might well be its use in generating estimates for the juvenile court ward population in Oregon. For example, we could (with certain modifications of the data)[1] attempt to estimate the number of slots needed in the state for wards to receive a certain service or treatment setting.

The data base presents almost unlimited possibilities for policy research aimed at answering questions on the unique presenting problems and service needs of Oregon's juvenile court wards. These questions are sure to surface from further discussions, analyses and presentations involving these data.

---

1 These modifications basically involve adding weights to adjust for under-and over-sampling. These weights could be established from an attempt to verify our earlier caseload census counts in certain counties and especially those with conflicting results.

APPENDIX A

DIRECTIONS FOR TELEPHONE SURVEY OF JUVENILE DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS OR THEIR ASSISTANTS

Steps:

(1.) Call each juvenile department director* and ask for each Oregon county (i.e., all 36) the following questions:

a. How many counselors are there in your department currently who carry active caseloads (that is they provide formal and informal case supervision services to juvenile referrals)? Give the exact number: _____(a)

b. Are there supervisory or management staff in your department who have active caseloads of juveniles in addition to those counselors listed above? (That is, do any supervisory staff double as counselors and supervise cases?)

_____ No

_____ Yes.
If yes, give exact number of individuals doing this: _____(b)

c. If they answer "yes" to item #1 above, ask them to give you the total number of staff involved--i.e., (a) + (b) = _____.
Also, ask if the supervisors carry a full caseload or not.

_____ Yes, full

_____ No, partial caseload

_____ Other, specify:_____

_____

_____

NOTE: The items with circled numbers are mandatory for the purposes of this survey. Items not circled are not critical if answers are unavailable or people have to call us back.

*If the director is unavailable ask for his or her assistant or other knowledgeable staff person available. Also, note that Mr. Ajax Moody is the director for both the Benton and Linn County Juvenile Departments. Therefore, fill out two questionnaires--one for Benton County and one for Linn County.

2. Ask if intake services are provided by regular juvenile department counselors or separate staff. That is, do special staff members (or "intake counselors") specialize and provide only intake services for clients not yet assigned to regular counselors or do the regular counselors in your department also provide intake services?

_____ Yes Notes:_____

_____ No _____

(3.) a. Ask the average size of a typical department counselor's caseload. Give estimated number of cases per counselor:_____

b. Also, give an estimate of the percentage of these cases which are official juvenile court wards (i.e., the proportion which are cases formally supervised or cases where petitions were filed and adjudication/disposition has occurred. Give approximate %:_____(%)

4. Ask if the estimates above include cases of juvenile court wards who have been committed to the care, custody, and control of CSD.

_____ Yes Notes:_____

_____ No _____

Also, ask if the department maintains active or joint supervision of official court wards who have been committed to the care, custody, and control of a CSD case worker.

_____ Yes Notes:_____

_____ No _____

(5.) Thank the party and record the following:

a. Name of Respondent:_____

b. County Juvenile Department:_____

c. Telephone No.:_____

d. Date:_____

e. Time of Day:_____

6. Will the party or someone else call back with additional information?

_____ Yes (If "yes," when:_____)

_____ No

APPENDIX B

DAVE FROHNMAYER
ATTORNEY GENERAL

WILLIAM F. GARY
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION
CRIME ANALYSIS CENTER
Justice Building
Salem, Oregon 97310
Telephone: (503) 378-4229

March 15, 1984

TO: Juvenile Department Directors

FROM: James P. Heuser, Ph.D., Researcher
Crime Analysis Center, Department of Justice

SUBJECT: POLICY PLANNING TASK FORCE CLIENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY, COMPONENT #1: Directions and Data Forms to Complete a Statewide Census of Formal Juvenile Court Wards Receiving Case Supervision and Casework Services from Oregon Juvenile Departments and the Children's Services Division

Our goal in this first component of the above-cited research is to conduct with the direct assistance of each juvenile department a census (or count) of all juvenile court wards in Oregon meeting the Policy Planning Task Force's criteria for inclusion in the client needs assessment study. To accomplish this census we are asking each juvenile department director to complete (with the assistance of their respective staffs and others) the enclosed data forms. The information requested on these forms will provide the Crime Analysis Center with a count and listing (with case numbers, names, and other identifiers) of cases for further study. The criteria for selection of cases for the study include all of the following characteristics:

CRITERIA FOR CASE SELECTION

a. Cases selected must be current or "active" juvenile court cases formally or officially supervised by a county juvenile department or the Children's Services Division (CSD). In other words, we are including official juvenile court wards that have had petitions filed and these petitions have resulted in adjudication and a disposition of wardship and in some cases temporary custody being granted to CSD. NOTE: In addition, we also are including new cases where adjudication has occurred recently but a final case disposition and custody decision awaits a dispositional hearing.

b. By current juvenile court cases, we mean those which are on active "official" supervision status or have been declared wards on or before March 15, 1984 regardless of whether the Children's Services Division has temporary custody and primary case supervision responsibility or your juvenile department maintains primary case supervision responsibility.

In cases where the dispositional hearings are pending, the adjudication hearing must have occurred on or before March 15, 1984 to be considered "active" cases for this census study.

c. In all the above cases, the petition filed and adjudicated can involve charges of delinquent offenses and/or status offenses and also dependency, abuse, and neglect charges.

To accomplish the tasks associated with this census of active, formal probation cases or current juvenile court wards assigned to CSD, we have enclosed with this letter a packet of different data forms with instructions. A white Form A is to be completed by each juvenile department counselor with an active caseload. Basically, it requests that he or she provide certain information on their caseload characteristics and that they identify and furnish a listing of current juvenile court wards on their caseload meeting the above criteria for inclusion in the census.

The yellow Form B is to be completed on those new cases where petitions have been filed and adjudication has occurred, but the case has not gone to a disposition hearing and may or may not have been officially assigned to a counselor's active caseload. These cases are in some post-adjudication/pre-disposition stage of juvenile court processing and are probably best known to a department's intake unit or to that staff person (or persons) responsible for intake services and preliminary case diagnosis. Form B, then, should be completed by someone familiar with newly adjudicated cases which may or may not have been assigned to active caseloads and are on the verge of becoming active juvenile court wards.

The pink Form C is to be completed on those active wards of the juvenile court who have been referred to Children's Services Division for temporary custody and primary casework supervision. These cases may or may not be jointly active on juvenile department counselor caseloads and they may or may not be easy to identify for the purposes of this census. In any case they should not be cases listed on Form A as cases active with a juvenile department counselor if CSD has primary casework responsibility. There should be, of course, some juvenile court record and legal file on each of these cases. Also, Children's Services Division will be providing some computer listings to indicate the juvenile court wards they have under their jurisdiction in each county to enhance the identification of these cases. At this time we are asking that you request that the juvenile court staff in your county or the district attorney provide this listing of juvenile court wards being actively supervised by CSD. This would include supervision in CSD's state training schools or supervision by CSD parole officers or other CSD field caseworkers. The attached diagram attempts to show in graphic terms the subgroups of juvenile court cases identified for each census study data form.

After receiving these data forms and insuring their security and the privacy of the subject identification information, we will use this information to select a random sample of cases statewide for the second stage or Component #2 of our needs assessment study.

In this second stage we will identify who these juvenile court wards are and furnish juvenile department counselors (and CSD staff where they have temporary custody and primary casework responsibility) with needs assessment forms to complete on an average of 3 to 6 such cases each.

Please have your juvenile department staff and the respective juvenile court staff or DA staff in your county complete these data forms and identify all actively supervised juvenile court wards (and newly adjudicated cases) in your county. We would like to receive the completed forms no later than April 2, 1984. If you have questions on how to conduct this important census or complete data forms, please contact me by phone at 378-4229 or 378-8056. Thank you again for your efforts to assist us.

JPH:jb
Enclosures
7074A-A73

FORM A
(White)

CASELOAD CENSUS DATA FORM FOR ACTIVELY SUPERVISED COURT WARDS

Directions: This questionnaire and listing of selected cases is to be completed by each juvenile department counselor (including any supervisory staff person doubling as a counselor) who has an active caseload of juvenile court wards. Please complete as accurately and completely as possible each section of this questionnaire. Place a check mark (✓) before each answer or response which applies.

Section I: Measures of Caseload Activity

1. Are you currently employed by this juvenile department on a full time or part time basis (disregarding whether or not your department has curtailed the length of a normal work week)?

   _____ a. Employed full time
   _____ b. Employed part time

2. What is currently the average length of your normal work week?

   _____ a. Under forty (40) hours, specify exact number of hours: _____
   _____ b. Exactly forty (40) hours per week
   _____ c. Over forty (40) hours, specify exact number of hours:_____

3. Are you currently serving in some supervisory capacity in this juvenile department (either part time or full time)?

   _____ a. No
   _____ c. Yes, part time
   _____ c. Yes, full time

4. If you currently serve in some supervisory role in this department do you devote a certain percentage of your time to casework and related probation supervision activities:

   _____ a. Does not apply, I do not have supervisory duties in this department

_____ b. Yes, I devote a certain percentage of my total weekly work hours to probation supervision of active cases assigned to me. Give an estimate of this percentage:_____%

5. As of March 15, 1984, what is the size of your overall caseload; i.e., how many cases have been assigned to you for active supervision regardless of whether or not supervision is formal or informal? Number of cases:_____

6. How many of these cases meet the following criteria:

   Cases formally supervised (i.e., they are official court wards with petitions filed and adjudication and disposition have occurred). Often, departments refer to these cases as receiving official probation supervision. In these cases the petition filed can involve charges of delinquent (i.e., criminal) offenses and/or status offenses; and also dependency, abuse, and neglect charges. Number of cases:_____

7. How many of these juvenile court wards (on formal probation or official supervision status above) on your caseload are concurrently active with CSD in the sense that CSD has temporary custody and you share casework responsibilities for them with a CSD caseworker? Number of cases:_____. Of this number, how many do you have where you are the one with the primary casework or case management responsibilities? No. of cases:_____.

8. In your department do you have responsibility for providing intake services to new cases where the petition filed has resulted in adjudication and a dispositional hearing is still pending?

   _____ a. Yes
   _____ b. No

9. If you answered "yes" to item #8 above, do you currently (as of March 15, 1984) have new cases assigned to you for intake (and other diagnostic) services where adjudication hearings have occurred but a disposition hearing is still pending?

   _____ a. No, does not apply
   _____ b. Yes, specify how many:_____

10. Using the information reported in items #1 through #9 above, complete a listing of all active court wards you have on your caseload where petitions were filed and adjudication and dispositional hearings have occurred. Use the next section of this form for this listing. Include newly adjudicated cases undergoing intake services and pending dispositional hearings only if they are to be assigned to you as part of your active caseload and you provided intake and diagnostic services for them. Also, include cases where Children's Services Division has temporary custody only if you are actively involved with this case and you maintain the primary casework supervision contact with the child. Provide your name and that of your county juvenile department below:

Counsellor's name (please print):

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Last Name

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

First Name

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Middle Name

Name of county juvenile department:

_____County Juvenile Department

6989A-A73

FORM A
(White)

Listing of Active Cases
on Individual Juvenile Department Counselor's Caseloads
Meeting Criteria for Inclusion in Study Census

County: _____ Counselor's Name: _____ (Last) _____ (First) _____ (M.I.)

	Legal Name of Child			Sex	Date of Birth			Juvenile Court Legal File Identification Number	Disposition Hearing Still Pending? (Circle Answers)	Temporary Custody Granted to CSD?	Other Pertinent Case Information
	Last Name	First Name	M.I.	(Circle)	Mo.	Day	Year				
1.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
2.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
3.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
4.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
5.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
6.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
7.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
8.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
9.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
10.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
11.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
12.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
13.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
14.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
15.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____

(continued on back)

	Legal Name of Child			Sex	Date of Birth			Juvenile Court Legal File Identification Number	Disposition Hearing Still Pending? (Circle Answers)	Temporary Custody Granted to CSD?	Other Pertinent Case Information
	Last Name	First Name	M.I.	(Circle)	Mo.	Day	Year				
16.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
17.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
18.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
19.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
20.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
21.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
22.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
23.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
24.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
25.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
26.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
27.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
28.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
29.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
30.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
31.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
32.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
33.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
34.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
35.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	

(use additional sheets if necessary)

FORM B
(Yellow)

Caseload Census Data Form for Newly Adjudicated Cases Pending Disposition

Directions: This questionnaire and listing of selected cases is to be completed by each juvenile department intake staff person (including supervisory staff members and counselors doubling as intake officers) who provide intake services to new juvenile court cases with petitions recently adjudicated and not yet assigned to counselors for official or formal probation due to the fact that a dispositional hearing has not yet occurred. Please complete each section of this questionnaire as accurately and completely as possible. NOTE: The attached listing of cases on this form is only to include cases which have not already appeared on the white Form A questionnaire. Place a check mark (✓) before each answer or response which applies.

Section I: Departmental Responsibilities

1. Do you currently handle intake services in this department on a full time or part time basis?

   _____ a. Yes, full time.

   _____ b. Yes, part time.

   _____ c. Does not apply - counselors in this department generally handle new cases from point of intake through case disposition and probation supervision.

   _____ d. Other, Specify:_____

   _____

2. If you are a juvenile department counselor or have responsiblity for supervising probation cases and you answered "a" or "does not apply" to item #1 above, have you completed a Form A questionnaire and included with it a listing of new cases with adjudication and disposition hearings pending which will be assigned to you for formal probation after a disposition hearing occurs?

   _____ a. Yes, complete question #4 on this questionnaire and go no further.

   _____ b. No, continue completing this questionnaire.

3. Please identify newly adjudicated cases undergoing intake services and official processing in your department (and juvenile court) as of March 15, 1984 and list them out on the attached section of this form. NOTE: If you have already listed out these cases on Form A (i.e., the white form used in this census to list active juvenile court wards currently on your caseload) do not include them on the attached listing with this yellow (Form B) questionnaire.

4. Provide your name, position, and employer's name and location in the spaces provided below:

   Your name (please print):

   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

   Last Name

   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

   First Name

   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

   Middle Name

Employer's Name:_____

County:_____

FORM B
(Yellow)

Listing of Recently Adjudicated Cases Awaiting Disposition Hearings and Known to Juvenile Department Counselors Providing Intake Services

County: _____ Counselor's Name: _____ (Last) _____ (First) _____ (M.I.)

	Legal Name of Child			Sex	Date of Birth			Juvenile Court Legal File Identification Number	Disposition Hearing Still Pending? (Circle Answers)	Temporary Custody Granted to CSD? (Circle Answers)	Other Pertinent Case Information
	Last Name	First Name	M.I.	(Circle)	Mo.	Day	Year				
1.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
2.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
3.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
4.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
5.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
6.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
7.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
8.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
9.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
10.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
11.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
12.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
13.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
14.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
15.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	

(continued on back)

	Legal Name of Child			Sex	Date of Birth			Juvenile Court Legal File Identification Number	Disposition Hearing Still Pending? (Circle Answers)	Temporary Custody Granted to CSD?	Other Pertinent Case Information
	Last Name	First Name	M.I.	(Circle)	Mo.	Day	Year				
16.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
17.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
18.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
19.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
20.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
21.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
22.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
23.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
24.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
25.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
26.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
27.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
28.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
29.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
30.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
31.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
32.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
33.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
34.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
35.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	

(use additional sheets if necessary)

FORM C
(Pink)

Caseload Census Data Form for Court Wards Active with Children's Services Division and Not Actively Supervised on Juvenile Department Formal Probation Caseloads

Directions: This questionnaire and listing of selected cases is to be completed by that person (or those people) in each juvenile department, D.A.'s office, or juvenile court, who is (are) most familiar with those formal and official juvenile court wards who are not on juvenile department counselor caseloads and have been assigned to CSD for temporary custody and care. These cases include all types of juvenile court wards who are currently on parole or are in the state training schools or other institutions in Oregon as of March 15, 1984.

1. Provide your name, position, and employer's name and location in the spaces provided below:

   Your name (please print):

   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐
   Last Name

   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐
   First Name

   ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐
   Middle Name

   Employer's Name: _____

   County: _____

2. Please identify and list on the attached form all those juvenile court wards who are not being actively supervised on current formal probation caseloads, but who are being supervised by CSD (as of March 15, 1984). Include here cases referred to CSD for temporary custody and care; training school commitment, or parole. NOTE: Do not include on this listing juvenile court wards where CSD and the county juvenile department maintain joint supervision and the juvenile department counselor is the primary case manager or probation supervisor. This form is only to include court wards where CSD has the primary responsibility for casework or case management services. Therefore, do not include cases that were listed on Form A (i.e., the white form used in this census to list active juvenile court wards where the juvenile department counselor provides the primary casework or case management services and has the primary responsibility for the case).

FORM C
(Pink)

Listing of Active Juvenile Court Wards Where CSD Maintains Temporary Custody and Primary Casework or Case Management Responsibility

County: _____ Counselor's Name: _____ (Last) _____ (First) _____ (M.I.)

	Legal Name of Child			Sex	Date of Birth			Juvenile Court Legal File Identification Number	Disposition Hearing Still Pending? (Circle Answers)	Temporary Custody Granted to CSD? (Circle Answers)	Other Pertinent Case Information
	Last Name	First Name	M.I.	(Circle)	Mo.	Day	Year				
1.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
2.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
3.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
4.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
5.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
6.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
7.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
8.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
9.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
10.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
11.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
12.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
13.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
14.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____
15.	_____	_____	___	M F	___	___	___	_____	Yes No	Yes No	_____

(continued on back)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Legal Name of Child			Sex	Date of Birth			Juvenile Court Legal File Identification Number	Disposition Hearing Still Pending? (Circle Answers)	Temporary Custody Granted to CSD?	Other Pertinent Case Information
	Last Name	First Name	M.I.	(Circle)	Mo.	Day	Year				
16.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
17.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
18.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
19.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
20.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
21.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
22.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
23.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
24.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
25.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
26.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
27.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
28.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
29.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
30.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
31.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
32.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
33.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
34.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	
35.				M F					Yes No	Yes No	

(use additional sheets if necessary)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C

I.D. No. ☐☐☐☐

County: ☐☐

JJS Policy Planning Task Force Statewide Client Needs Assessment Study
Component Two: "Sample Survey of Selected Court Wards"

CLIENT BACKGROUND AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

COVER SHEET

The identifying information on this cover sheet is to be used solely as a basis for insuring that the information and data gathered for this research is both accurate and complete with regard to each juvenile selected for inclusion in the needs assessment survey sample. By requesting the full name (and "aka" name) of each juvenile court ward sampled and requesting the identity of each person completing this form, we will have some basis for linking each questionnaire to the appropriate data sources should questions arise as to how to code the necessary data for computer processing. The information in this questionnaire will remain confidential at all times and the cover sheets with their "name" information will be destroyed immediately after the conclusion of this six-month study in 1984.

"Case" Information (i.e., on the juvenile selected in our sample)

Client's Name: ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐
Last

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐.
First M.I.

AKA: _____

Legal Case File No.: _____

Date of Birth: _____ Sex: (Circle) Male Female

"Counselor or Caseworker" Information (i.e., on the person completing this questionnaire)

Name: ☐☐☐

JJS Policy Planning Task Force Statewide Client Needs Assessment Study
Component Two: "Sample Survey of Selected Court Wards"

CLIENT BACKGROUND AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Juvenile Court Case File Data - Face Sheet Information

Item No.		Card 1	Marginal Frequencies Listed by Response Codes and/or Summary Statistics for all Items and the Total Sample (N=442)[a]
1. Sex:	1=Male 2=Female 9=Unknown	1	1=58.1% (257) 2=41.9% (185) 9= 0.0% (0)
2. Race:	1=White or Caucasian (non-Hispanic) 2=Black, Negro, or Afro-American 3=Hispanic, Chicano, or Spanish-speaking heritage 4=Oriental (Asian or Pacific Islander) 5=(American) Indian 8=Other, (specify):_____ 9=Unknown	2	1=81.4% (360) 2= 7.2% (32) 3= 4.3% (19) 4= 1.1% (5) 5= 3.2% (14) 8= 1.6% (7) 9= 0.2% (1)
3. Date of Birth:	Mo. 3 4 Day 5 6 Year 7 8		Age as of March 15, 1984: Average = 13.4 years Standard Deviation = 4.8 years Median = 15.1 years
4. County of Current Residence (i.e., County Where the Child is Physically Residing at the Moment, Including Out-of-home Care Placements or Institutionalization Stay):	01=Baker, 02=Benton, 03=Clackamas, 04=Clatsop, 05=Columbia, 06=Coos, 07=Crook, 08=Curry, 09=Deschutes, 10=Douglas, 11=Gilliam, 12=Grant, 13=Harney, 14=Hood River, 15=Jackson, 16=Jefferson, 17=Josephine, 18=Klamath, 19=Lake, 20=Lane, 21=Lincoln, 22=Linn, 23=Malheur, 24=Marion, 25=Morrow, 26=Multnomah, 27=Polk, 28=Sherman, 29=Tillamook, 30=Umatilla, 31=Union, 32=Wallowa, 33=Wasco, 34=Washington, 35=Wheeler, 36=Yamhill, 88=Out of State or Other (specify):_____, 99=Unknown	9 10	01= 0.5% (2) 20= 6.6% (29) 02= 1.1% (5) 21= 1.8% (8) 03= 3.8% (17) 22= 2.0% (9) 04= 0.7% (3) 23= 1.6% (7) 05= 0.1% (5) 24=14.0% (62) 06= 1.8% (8) 25= 0.7% (3) 07= 0.2% (1) 26=21.5% (95) 08= 0.2% (1) 27= 2.0% (9) 09= 2.3% (10) 28= 0.2% (1) 10= 3.2% (14) 29= 1.8% (8) 11= 0.0% (0) 30= 1.1% (5) 12= 0.5% (2) 31= 0.9% (4) 13= 0.2% (1) 32= 0.2% (1) 14= 1.1% (5) 33= 1.4% (6) 15= 3.6% (16) 34= 5.2% (23) 16= 1.1% (5) 35= 0.0% (0) 17= 2.0% (9) 36= 2.0% (9) 18= 2.7% (12) 88= 6.3% (28) 19= 0.2% (1) 99= 4.0% (18)
5. How long (to the nearest whole year) has this individual been a resident of the above county?	1=One year or less, 2=Two years, 3=Three years, 4=Four years, 5=Five years, 6=Six years, 7=Seven years, 8=Eight years or more, 9=Unknown	11	1=22.4% (99) 2=10.0% (44) 3= 3.8% (17) 4= 5.7% (25) 5= 3.8% (17) 6= 2.3% (10) 7= 3.2% (14) 8=39.1% (173) 9= 9.7% (43)
6. Current Residence (5-Digit) Zip Code: (9's or 99999=Unknown)		12 13 14 15 16	"Data available on request"
7. Area in Which Child Currently Resides:	1=In a large city (over 250,000) 2=In a medium size city (50,000-250,000) 3=In a small city or town (under 50,000) 4=In a suburb near a city 5=On a farm or ranch 6=In open country but not on a farm or ranch 8=Other, (specify):_____ 9=Unknown	17	1=19.7% (87) 2=14.3% (63) 3=39.6% (175) 4= 5.0% (22) 5= 3.2% (14) 6= 9.3% (41) 8= 1.8% (8) 9= 5.7% (25)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8. Current Living Arrangement of Child: ☐☐ 18 19

In own home:

01=With both parents
02=With mother & stepfather
03=With father & stepmother
04=With mother only
05=With father only
06=In home of relatives
07=In foster family home
08=In institution (specify):_____
09=In independent living arrangements
10=In other place (specify):_____
99=Unknown

01=11.1% (49)	07=18.1% (80)	
02= 7.0% (31)	08=11.5% (51)	
03= 3.4% (15)	09= 2.3% (10)	
04=22.9% (101)	10= 7.7% (34)	
05= 2.9% (13)	99= 4.7% (5)	
06= 8.4% (37)		

9. Current Marital Status of Natural Parents: ☐☐ 20 21

01=Parents married and living together

One or both parents dead:

02=Both dead
03=Father dead
04=Mother dead

Parents separated:

05=Divorced or legally separated
06=Father deserted mother
07=Mother deserted father
08=Other reason (specify):_____
09=Parents not married to each other
10=Other status (specify):_____
99=Unknown

01=17.9% (79)
02= 0.5% (2)
03= 3.4% (15)
04= 3.2% (14)
05=51.8% (229)
06= 3.4% (15)
07= 0.7% (3)
08= 2.0% (9)
09=11.5% (51)
10= 1.4% (6)
99= 4.3% (19)

10. Which of the following categories represents the "best estimate" of this child's family's total yearly income? ☐ 22

1=$2,999 or less
2=$3,000 - $5,999
3=$6,000 - $9,999
4=$10,000 - $14,999
5=$15,000 - $24,999
6=$25,000 - $49,999
7=$50,000 or more
8=Other (specify):_____
9=Unknown

1= 8.4% (37)
2=12.9% (57)
3=17.4% (77)
4=17.2% (76)
5=13.1% (58)
6= 9.5% (42)
7= 0.9% (4)
8= 0.5% (2)
9=20.2% (89)

11. Is this child's family currently receiving public assistance (other than state payments for out-of-home care or institutionalization)? ☐ 23

1=Yes
2=No, but did in past
3=No, never
8=Other (specify):_____
9=Unknown

1=18.8% (83)
2=25.8% (114)
3=31.4% (139)
8= 2.9% (13)
9=21.0% (93)

12. Child's Current School Student Status: ☐ 24

1=Full time
2=Part time
3=Suspended
4=Expelled
5=Discontinued, no diploma or GED awarded
6=Discontinued, graduated from high school
7=Discontinued, GED awarded
8=Other, specify:_____
9=Unknown

1=60.9% (269)	5=10.2% (45)
2= 3.4% (15)	6= 2.3% (10)
3= 1.1% (5)	7= 3.4% (15)
4= 0.5% (2)	8=12.9% (57)
	9= 5.4% (24)

13. Child's Current Employment Status: ☐ 25

1=Not employed
2=Employed full time
3=Employed part time
8=Other (specify):_____
9=Unknown

1=68.3% (302)
2= 2.5% (11)
3=14.0% (62)
8= 7.0% (31)
9= 8.2% (36)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14. Child's Current School Type: ☐ 26

1=Regular school/mainstream
2=Regular school/special ed.
3=Regular school/vocactional ed.
4=Alternative school program
5=Vocational or trade school
6=Day treatment program (mental health)
7=GED program
8=Other (specify):_____
9=Unknown

1=41.0%	(181)	6= 0.7%	(3)
2=14.0%	(62)	7= 4.1%	(18)
3= 0.9%	(4)	8=22.4%	(99)
4= 5.0%	(22)	9=10.6%	(47)
5= 1.4%	(6)		

15. Highest Grade Completed (not including current and using K through 12+) ☐☐ 27 28

00 (or K) 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11 12 (or more)

00=14.0%	(62)	07= 7.0%	(31)
01= 0.9%	(4)	08=14.2%	(63)
02= 1.8%	(8)	09=15.6%	(69)
03= 2.0%	(9)	10=15.2%	(67)
04= 3.2%	(14)	11=10.9%	(48)
05= 2.7%	(12)	12= 5.0%	(22)
06= 4.0%	(18)	99= 3.4%	(15)

16. Current Grade Placement (in School) in Relation to Age: ☐ 29

1=Retarded (somewhat or much older than classmates)
2=At Expected Level (same or similar age as classmates)
3=Accelerated (somewhat or much younger than classmates)
4=Inapplicable (not in school)
8=Other (specify):_____
9=Unknown

1=12.7%	(56)		
2=55.0%	(243)		
3= 0.9%	(4)		
4=18.3%	(81)		
8= 5.2%	(23)		
9= 7.9%	(35)		

Note:

In the next section of this report, we ask some questions about this child's current juvenile court status. We refer to this status as either "current or pending juvenile court jurisdiction/wardship." This terminology was used to avoid confusion--especially as "wardship" may have either a broad or narrow definition. In this questionnaire we define wardship in the generic (or general) sense to include any child who is under juvenile court jurisdiction because of adjudication on a petition where at least a delinquent act, status offense, or dependency status is substantiated and results in a current or pending disposition. By "pending" we mean that the adjudication hearing and finding of fact have occurred and a separate disposition hearing is still pending.

Please remember in this next section to reference or key your answers to the original juvenile court petition which resulted in the child's current juvenile court jurisdiction/wardship in Oregon. If the child is not yet a ward and wardship (jurisdiction) is pending, key your answers or responses to the petition on which the child was adjudicated and awaits a disposition hearing.

Information on the Original (or the Most Recent) Juvenile Court Petition Resulting in Current (or Pending) Juvenile Court Jurisdiction/Wardship in Oregon

17. Was this child made a court ward in another state and transferred to Oregon via the Interstate Compact? ☐ 30

1=Yes (See note below)
2=No
9=Unknown

1= 2.3%	(10)		
2=96.8%	(428)		
9= 0.9%	(4)		

Note:

If you answered "yes" to Item #17 (above), answer the remaining questions in this section based on why and when this child was declared a juvenile court ward in the other state and according to the provisions of his/her supervision in Oregon.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

18. Date of Adjudication (Jurisdictional) Hearing on Original Petition Resulting in Current (or Pending) Juvenile Court Jurisdiction/Wardship: Mo. ☐☐ (31 32) Day ☐☐ (33 34) Year ☐☐ (35 36)

"Data available on request"

19. What was the most serious offense or petition complaint which was substantiated or proved in the above cited adjudication (jurisdictional) hearing (in Item #18 above)? ☐☐ (37 38)

Offenses applicable to both juveniles and adults (excluding traffic)

01=Murder & non-negligent manslaughter	11=Larceny: Shoplifting	01= 0.0%	(0)	11= 3.8%	(17)
02=Manslaughter by negligence	12=Larceny: all except Shoplifting	02= 0.2%	(1)	12= 6.1%	(27)
03=Forcible rape	13=Weapon carrying or possessing	03= 0.5%	(2)	13= 0.7%	(3)
04=Robbery: Purse snatching by force	14=Sex offenses (except forc. rape)	04= 0.0%	(0)	14= 3.8%	(17)
05=Robbery: All except purse snatching	15=Violation of drug laws: Narcotic	05= 1.4%	(6)	15= 0.5%	(2)
06=Assault: Aggravated (1st-3rd degree)	16=Violation of drug laws:	06= 0.0%	(0)	16= 0.5%	(2)
07=Assault: All except aggravated	All except narcotic	07= 2.7%	(12)	17= 0.0%	(0)
08=Burglary-breaking or entering	17=Drunkenness	08=14.5%	(64)	18= 0.2%	(1)
09=Auto theft: Unauthorized use	18=Disorderly conduct	09= 3.6%	(16)	19= 2.7%	(12)
10=Auto theft: All except unauthorized use	19=Vandalism	10= 0.0%	(0)	20= 0.7%	(3)
	20=Arson			21= 7.9%	(35)
	21=Other delinquent (specify):____				

Offenses applicable to juveniles only (excluding traffic)

31=Running away	34=Ungovernable behavior	31= 3.2%	(14)	34= 4.1%	(18)
32=Truancy	35=Possessing or drinking of liquor	32= 0.0%	(0)	35= 1.4%	(6)
33=Violation of curfew	36=Other status (specify):_____	33= 0.0%	(0)	36= 0.9%	(4)

Traffic offenses

41=Driving while intoxicated (DWI or DUII)	44=Driving without a license (including DWS or driving while suspended)	41= 0.5%	(2)	44= 0.2%	(1)
42=Hit and run		42= 0.0%	(0)	45= 0.0%	(0)
43=Reckless driving		43= 0.2%	(1)		
	45=All other traffic (specify):____				

Neglect (abuse, desertion, inadequate care, etc.)

51=Abuse	51=14.0%	(62)
52=All other neglect (specify):_____	52=23.1%	(102)

20. How would you classify the type of offense or reason cited (in Item #19 above): ☐ (39)

1=Criminal (or delinquent) act: against the person	1=16.5%	(73)
2=Criminal (or delinquent) act: against property	2=34.6%	(153)
3=Criminal (or delinquent) act: against statute, (specify):_____	3= 1.6%	(7)
4=Noncriminal: status offense	4= 7.5%	(33)
5=Noncriminal: dependency, abuse, and/or neglect	5=34.6%	(153)
6=Traffic violation	6= 0.5%	(2)
7=Fishing, boating, or game law violations	7= 0.0%	(0)
8=Other (specify):_____	8= 2.5%	(11)
9=Unknown (don't know)	9= 2.3%	(10)

21. If the petition offense or complaint cited in Item #19 (above) is considered a criminal (or delinquent) act, can it be classified as a felony? ☐ (40)

0=Does not apply, not classified a delinquent or criminal act	0=35.1%	(155)
1=Yes (a felony)	1=33.0%	(146)
3=No (not a felony)	3=25.6%	(113)
8=Uncertain or can't ascertain (not enough information)	8= 2.0%	(9)
9=Unknown	9= 4.3%	(15)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

22. Did a separate disposition hearing occur as a result of the adjudication hearing cited in Item #18 (above) or was the disposition on the adjudicated petition handled as a part of this adjudication hearing? ☐ 41

0=Does not apply, disposition hearing still pending
1=Separate disposition hearing held
2=Disposition was handled as a part of the adjudication hearing cited in Item #18 (above)
8=Other (specify):_____
9=Unknown

0= 3.8% (17)
1=19.0% (84)
2=70.1% (310)
8= 4.3% (19)
9= 2.7% (12)

---

23. What was the date of the disposition hearing in Item #22 (above)? (Note: If the disposition of the case occurred at the adjudication hearing, report the date of this hearing as listed in Item #18 above.)

Mo. ☐☐ 42 43 Day ☐☐ 44 45 Year ☐☐ 46 47

"Data available on request"

---

24. If you indicated that a disposition of this case has occurred (in Item #22 above), what specific disposition(s) resulted from this adjudication (i.e., from the substantiated complaint)? Indicate up to three (3) dispositions, if applicable):

1st: ☐☐ 48 49
2nd: ☐☐ 50 51
3rd: ☐☐ 52 53

00=Not applicable, disposition hearing still pending

No transfer of legal custody:

01=Juvenile court probation officer to supervise

02=Referred to another agency or individual for supervision (specify):_____

03=Runaway returned to:_____

_____

04=Other (specify):_____

_____

Transfer of legal custody to:

11=CSD-caseworker to supervise

12=CSD-state training school or other public institution for delinquents (specify):_____

13=Other CSD (specify):_____

14=Other public institution (specify):_____

15=Public agency or department (including court) (specify):_____

16=Private agency or institution (specify)_____

17=Individual (specify):_____

18=Other (specify):_____

Legal custody unknown:

88=Other (specify):_____

99=Unknown

1st

00= 2.9% (13)
01=29.2% (129)
02= 4.3% (19)
03= 0.5% (2)
04= 5.0% (22)
11=43.4% (192)
12= 3.8% (17)
13= 4.1% (18)
14= 0.5% (2)
15= 1.8% (8)
16= 0.2% (1)
17= 0.7% (3)
18= 0.2% (1)
88= 0.5% (2)
99= 2.9% (13)

2nd

00= 2.0% (9)
01= 1.4% (6)
02= 3.6% (16)
03= 0.0% (0)
04= 6.3% (28)
11= 6.3% (28)
12= 2.0% (9)
13= 5.2% (23)
14= 0.9% (4)
15= 1.6% (7)
16= 2.3% (10)
17= 1.6% (7)
18= 1.8% (8)
88= 0.5% (2)
99=64.5% (285)

3rd

00= 2.5% (11)
01= 0.7% (3)
02= 0.0% (0)
03= 0.0% (0)
04= 2.3% (10)
11= 0.9% (4)
12= 1.4% (6)
13= 0.9% (4)
14= 0.2% (1)
15= 0.7% (3)
16= 0.2% (1)
17= 0.5% (2)
18= 0.9% (4)
88= 0.7% (3)
99=88.3% (390)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

25. Was placement with CSD for custody, care, and control a part of the final custody decision (above)? [54]

0=Not applicable, disposition hearing still pending
1=Yes
2=No
9=Unknown

0= 3.8% (17)
1=60.2% (266)
2=33.5% (148)
9= 2.5% (11)

Note:

In this next section you are asked to review the child's juvenile court referral history (in Oregon and elsewhere, if available) and to answer the questions according to your knowledge of the case and best professional judgment. For our purposes we define "referral" in the same way as on the National Center for Juvenile Justice's Juvenile Court Statistical Card. This is the same as the old RS-35 form used by CSD and the U.S. Children's Bureau. A "referral" refers to an incident which may have involved several offenses or complaints. Please do not count each reason for a particular incident as a separate referral. Also, include both substantiated and unsubstantiated referrals known in your jurisdiction and any previous jurisdiction.

Juvenile Court Referral History Information

26. In reviewing this child's juvenile court referral history, why in your judgement, was this child originally or first made or declared a ward of the court? [55]

1=As a result of a one-time act or behavior which required court supervision and/or intervention

2=As a result of a series of acts or behaviors which required court supervision and/or intervention

8=Other (specify):_____

_____

9=Unknown (or don't know)

1=24.9% (110)

2=50.7% (224)

8=23.1% (102)

9= 1.3% (6)

---

27. Number of All Known (i.e., Documented) Prior Juvenile Court Contacts or Referrals: [56] [57]

99=Unknown

Average = 3.1
Standard Deviation = 4.5
Median = 1.6
Unknowns - 109 (99's)

---

28. Type of Most Serious Charge(s) or Complaint(s) Among These Referrals (Above), If Any: [58]

1=Criminal or delinquent act against the person
2=Criminal or delinquent act against property
3=Criminal or delinquent act against statute
(specify):_____
4=Noncriminal: Status offenses
5=Noncriminal: Dependent, abused and/or neglected
6=Traffic violation
7=Fishing, boating, or game law violations
8=Other (specify):_____
9=Unknown

1=14.5% (64)
2=32.4% (143)
3= 1.4% (6)
4= 5.2% (23)
5=30.3% (134)
6= 0.2% (1)
7= 0.0% (0)
8= 4.5% (20)
9=11.6% (51)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

29. Did any of these known juvenile court contacts or referrals involve or result in "pre-adjudication" detention stay: [59]

1=Yes	1=16.3% (72)
2=No	2=75.6% (334)
9=Unknown	9= 5.5% (24)

30. Did any of these known juvenile court referrals (or contacts) result in an out-of-home care placement (excluding detention and shelter care)? [60]

1=Yes	1=43.9% (194)
2=No	2=50.9% (225)
9=Unknown	9= 5.3% (23)

31. If you answered "yes" to Item #30 (above), approximately how many times did out-of-home care placement occur (i.e., how many out-of-home care placements were there in all in Oregon or elsewhere, excluding detention and shelter care)? [61]

0=No out-of-home care placements	5=Five	0=41.9% (185)	5= 0.9% (4)
1=One	6=Six	1=21.9% (97)	6= 1.1% (5)
2=Two	7=Seven	2= 8.1% (36)	7= 0.2% (1)
3=Three	8=Eight or more	3= 4.3% (19)	8= 2.3% (10)
4=Four	9=Unknown	4= 3.4% (15)	9=15.8% (70)

32. Did any of these known juvenile court referrals (or contacts) result in commitment to a training school or reformatory? [62]

1=Yes	1= 7.7% (34)
2=No	2=87.3% (386)
9=Unknown	9= 5.0% (22)

Note:

Item #33 (below) refers to remand to an adult court for case processing due to involvement in a criminal act. However, we are excluding "blanket" remands for violations of traffic, fishing, boating, or game laws. If your answer to Item #33 (below) is "No" (i.e., never remanded), please use the "0" or "00" codes (i.e., "does not apply) for Items #34 through #36a.

33. Did any of these known prior juvenile court referrals (or contacts) result in the child's being remanded (excluding "blanket" remands) to an adult criminal court for processing? [63]

1=Yes	1= 0.2% (1)
2=No	2=82.6% (365)
9=Unknown	9=17.1% (76)

34. If you answered "yes" to Item #33 (above), was this child placed in a "permanent remand" status (i.e., after initially being remanded any new law violation automatically will result in remand to an adult criminal court.)? [64]

0=Does not apply (never remanded)	0=81.9% (362)
1=Yes	1= 0.2% (1)
2=No	2= 6.3% (28)
9=Unknown	9=11.5% (51)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

35. If you answered "yes" to Item #33 (above), what was the type of most serious charge or referral reason resulting in remand to an adult criminal court for prosecution? [65]

0=Does not apply (never remanded)
1=Criminal (delinquent): against the person
2=Criminal (delinquent): against property
3=Criminal (delinquent): against statute, specify:_____
8=Other, specify_____
9=Unknown

0=85.7% (379)
1= 0.2% (1)
2= 0.7% (3)
3= 0.2% (1)
8= 0.7% (3)
9=12.4% (55)

36a. If you answered "yes" to Item #33 (above), what specifically was the most serious offense charge or referral reason resulting in remand to an adult criminal court for prosecution? [66] [67]

00=Does not apply (never remanded)
01=Murder & non-negligent manslaughter
02=Manslaughter by negligence
03=Forcible rape
04=Robbery: Purse snatching by force
05=Robbery: All except purse snatching
06=Assault: Aggravated (1st-3rd degree)
07=Assault: All except aggravated
08=Burglary-breaking or entering
09=Auto theft: Unauthorized use
10=Auto theft: All except unauthorized use
11=Larceny: Shoplifting
12=Larceny: all except Shoplifting
13=Weapon carrying, possessing, etc.
14=Sex offenses (except forcible rape)
15=Violation of drug laws: Narcotic
16=Violation of drug laws: All except narcotic
17=Drunkenness
18=Disorderly conduct
19=Vandalism
20=Arson
21=Other delinquent (specify):_____

00=85.1% (376)
03= 0.2% (1)
07= 0.5% (2)
08= 0.5% (2)
20= 0.2% (1)

Missing data=13.6% (60)

All other values= 0.0% (0)

36b. In reviewing this child's first known (or documented) juvenile court referral anywhere, what was the most serious referral reason or complaint? [68] [69]

Note: Use previous codes from Item #19 on page 4 to fill in the boxes to the right.

Columns #70-75 Reserved

01= 0.0%	(0)	18= 0.5%	(2)		
02= 0.2%	(1)	19= 2.3%	(10)		
03= 0.9%	(4)	20= 1.8%	(8)		
04= 0.0%	(0)	21= 7.5%	(33)		
05= 1.8%	(8)	31= 4.1%	(18)		
06= 0.5%	(2)	32= 0.5%	(2)		
07= 3.4%	(15)	33= 0.5%	(2)		
08=12.0%	(53)	34= 3.6%	(16)		
09= 2.0%	(9)	35= 1.1%	(5)		
10= 0.0%	(0)	36= 0.7%	(3)		
11= 3.2%	(14)	41= 0.0%	(0)		
12= 5.0%	(22)	42= 0.0%	(0)		
13= 0.5%	(2)	43= 0.0%	(0)		
14= 2.9%	(13)	44= 0.2%	(1)		
15= 0.7%	(3)	45= 0.2%	(1)		
16= 0.5%	(2)	51=13.1%	(58)		
17= 0.2%	(1)	52=19.5%	(86)		

Missing data=10.9% (48)

37. Client (Subject) I.D. Number for Study: ID. NO.

Note: Use I.D. number from cover sheet in the boxes to the right. [76] [77] [78] [79]

38. Card Number: 1 [80]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Client Problem Profile Related to Current Juvenile Court Jurisdiction/Wardship or Juvenile Court Referral History

Card 2

39. In reviewing this child's total juvenile court referral history (as presented in the last two sections of this questionnaire), which of the following would you consider salient or strong factors in the child's current need for juvenile justice system services and treatment? (Place a "1" in the box next to each factor which applies):

a.	Seriousness (or severity) of the offense(s) or reason(s) resulting in juvenile court referral(s) or contact(s) (i.e., danger to self or others)	1	1=37.6% (166)
b.	Chronic juvenile court involvement (i.e., a sizeable number of prior referrals)	2	1=18.8% (83)
c.	Indication that the alleged offense(s) was (were) committed in an aggressive, violent, premeditated and/or willful manner	3	1=21.0% (93)
d.	Criminal sophistication of the juvenile's offense history--especially in terms of career type involvement in crime of a predatory nature	4	1= 6.1% (27)
e.	Amenability to treatment (i.e., the likelihood of rehabilitation by use of procedures, services, and facilities available to the juvenile court)	5	1=38.9% (172)
f.	Chronic involvement in "runs" from own home or from out-of-home care placement settings	6	1=15.2% (67)
g.	Evidence that the child has been the victim of sexual abuse perpetrated by parent(s) and/or other significant adult(s)	7	1=20.8% (92)
h.	Evidence that the child has been the victim of physical abuse perpetrated by parent(s) and/or other significant adult(s)	8	1=29.2% (129)
i.	Evidence of any other forms of child neglect (except "g" and "h" above)	9	1=43.2% (191)
j.	Indication or evidence that the child's involvement in acts of violence against others resulted in personal injury to one or more victims which required some form of medical treatment or therapy	10	1= 5.7% (25)
k.	Indication or evidence that the child's involvement in property crime resulted in the loss or damage of property collectively worth over $200 for any one incident	11	1=19.2% (85)
l.	Indication or evidence that the child's involvement in criminal acts and/or status offenses stemmed (at least in part) from some form of drug abuse	12	1=18.3% (81)
m.	Indication or evidence that the child's involvement in criminal acts and/or status offenses stemmed (at least in part) from some form of alcohol abuse	13	1=17.6% (78)
n.	Indication or evidence that the child's juvenile court referrals demonstrate a pattern of progressive seriousness or "escalation" in severity	14	1=24.4% (108)
o.	Juvenile court referral history indicates heavy or excessive involvement in felony offenses	15	1= 5.9% (26)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Critical Events Profile

40. Provide Dates for Each of the Following Critical or Significant Events for This Child (Regardless of Whether or Not These Events Occurred in Oregon):

Note: If any of these dates are unknown, fill in the boxes to the right of the respective date with 9's (i.e., 99 99 99). Likewise if any of these events have not occurred as yet (and are therefore "not applicable") fill in the boxes to the right of the respective date with 8's (i.e., 88 88 88).

		Mo. (16 17)	Day (18 19)	Year (20 21)
a.	Date of first known (or documented) juvenile court referral anywhere- - - - -			
b.	Date of first known (or documented) formal or informal juvenile court service(s)- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	(22 23)	(24 25)	(26 27)
c.	Date of first out-of-home care placement (excluding shelter care)- - - -	(28 29)	(30 31)	(32 33)
d.	Date of first known (or documented) Children's Services Division (CSD) services in Oregon- - - - - - - - - - - -	(34 35)	(36 37)	(38 39)
e.	Date first committed to a state training school or reformatory- - - - - -	(40 41)	(42 43)	(44 45)
f.	Date first "remanded" to an adult criminal court (excluding blanket remands for traffic, fishing, game, or boating violations)- - - - - - - - - -	(46 47)	(48 49)	(50 51)
g.	Date of first "dependency" petition in juvenile court (including abuse or neglect) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	(52 53)	(54 55)	(56 57)

"Data available on request"

Note: Please look back to your response to Item #23 on page 5. If this child was made a ward of the juvenile court in Oregon (or in another state and transferred to Oregon) does this date accurately reflect the date that juvenile court jurisdiction/wardship began (i.e., the earliest known anywhere). If not, please provide the proper date as follows:

Mo.	Day	Year

Also, explain the discrepancy in dates, if any: _____

_____

_____

Note: In the next section please answer according to your knowledge of this case and the documentation that exists in juvenile court and/or CSD case files using your best professional judgement as the counselor or caseworker assigned to this child.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Profile of Current Presenting Problems for Treatment/Services

41. Is this child <u>currently</u> in danger of abuse, neglect, or exploitation? (Of the following responses, select the one that <u>best</u> describes the child's <u>current</u> situation <u>in your professional judgment</u>): ☐☐ 58 59

Note: When completing this item (#41) and the next one (#42) please include only <u>documented</u> instances. Also note that "documented" does not necessarily mean that a petition was filed in juvenile court citing this instance.

00=Does not apply (child not in danger)

Child in imminent physical danger

01=Physical abuse
02=Sexual abuse
03=Abandonment
04=Neglect
05=Inadequate parenting (chronic absence of parent and/or normal nurturing) and exposure to physical danger
06=Other (specify): _____

Child in emotional or mental danger

07=Inadequate parenting (child not threatened by physical danger)
08=Parents not considered able to carry out normal parenting role (mentally retarded, developmentally disabled, emotionally disabled, etc.)

09=Child has a <u>developmental disability</u> which parents cannot cope with
10=Child has a <u>mental disability</u> which parents cannot cope with
11=Child has an <u>emotional disability</u> which parents cannot cope with
12=Other, (specify): _____

Other (<u>including some combination of the above</u>)

Note: If some combination of the above, indicate which codes apply by listing out the respective numbers.

88=Other (specify): _____

99=Unknown

42. Was this child <u>ever in the past</u> in danger of abuse, neglect, or exploitation? (Of the responses listed in Item #41 above, select the one that <u>best</u> describes the child's <u>past</u> situation <u>in your professional judgment</u>). ☐☐ 60 61

Item #41	
00=	65.8% (291)
01=	1.1% (5)
02=	3.6% (16)
03=	0.5% (2)
04=	1.4% (6)
05=	4.1% (18)
06=	1.8% (8)
07=	7.7% (34)
08=	2.0% (9)
09=	0.2% (1)
10=	0.7% (3)
11=	1.6% (7)
12=	2.5% (11)
88=	4.3% (19)
99=	2.8% (12)

Item #42	
00=	19.9% (88)
01=	12.2% (54)
02=	12.9% (57)
03=	2.7% (12)
04=	8.1% (36)
05=	16.5% (73)
06=	2.5% (11)
07=	8.1% (36)
08=	2.3% (10)
09=	0.9% (4)
10=	1.4% (6)
11=	2.3% (10)
12=	2.3% (10)
88=	2.5% (11)
99=	5.5% (24)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

43. Using the ranking system outlined below, how would you rate each of the following "presenting" problems for this child. (By presenting problems, we mean those that currently present themselves to the counselor or caseworker as requiring treatment or services which he/she directly or indirectly provides and/or coordinates):

Note: Rank each listed problem or problem area by filling in the respective boxes with the appropriate numerical values from the following scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not a problem	a very mild problem	a mild problem	a moderate problem	a serious problem	a very serious problem

Individual/Personal Problems

(1) Substance abuse--drugs	62	0=58.4% (258) 1-5=37.6% (166)
(2) Substance abuse--alcohol	63	0=57.0% (252) 1-5=38.2% (169)
(3) Substance abuse--Other, (specify):_____	64	0=85.3% (377) 1-5= 4.5% (20)
(4) Suicide attempt(s)	65	0=82.4% (364) 1-5=12.7% (56)
(5) Mentally retarded/developmentally disabled (diagnosed)	66	0=79.6% (352) 1-5=15.4% (68)
(6) Mentally or emotionally disturbed (diagnosed)	67	0=68.6% (303) 1-5=27.4% (121)
(7) Poor self-concept/low self esteem	68	0=24.2% (107) 1-5=72.6% (321)
(8) Difficulty relating to or communicating with others--peers	69	0=33.9% (150) 1-5=62.9% (278)
(9) Difficulty relating to or communicating with others--adults	70	0=29.4% (130) 1-5=68.1% (301)
(10) Hyperactive	71	0=70.1% (310) 1-5=25.1% (111)
(11) Inadequate internal control (lacks self discipline)	72	0=26.9% (119) 1-5=70.4% (311)
(12) Shows impulsive, neurotic behavior	73	0=45.0% (199) 1-5=51.6% (228)
(13) Most serious other personal/individual problem--rank (and specify):_____	74	0=45.5% (201) 1-5=28.3% (125)

Note: Item #43 is continued on the next page

Column #75 Reserved

44. Client (Subject) I.D. Number for Study: ID. NO.

Note: Use I.D. number from cover sheet in the boxes to the right. [76] [77] [78] [79]

45. Card Number: 2 [80]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

43. (Continued):

Note: Rank each listed problem or problem area by filling in the respective boxes with the appropriate numerical values from the following scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not a problem	a very mild problem	a mild problem	a moderate problem	a serious problem	a very serious problem

Family Problems

Card 3

(14) Parental or significant adult encouragement of illegal or illegitimate (anti-social) goals, means (opportunities), and/or behaviors	1	0=55.2% (244) 1-5=40.5% (179)
(15) Inadequate level of parental involvement in child's life	2	0=20.1% (89) 1-5=77.8% (344)
(16) Dysfunctional parents (i.e., marital conflicts interfere with parental functioning)	3	0=26.9% (119) 1-5=69.9% (309)
(17) Inconsistent or inadequate parental discipline/limit setting	4	0=18.8% (83) 1-5=78.7% (348)
(18) Inadequate compliance to parental limit setting or rules	5	0=26.2% (116) 1-5=69.9% (309)
(19) Verbally antagonistic toward parents and/or other adults in the family	6	0=39.1% (173) 1-5=57.0% (252)
(20) Verbally antagonistic toward siblings and/or other children in the family	7	0=50.7% (224) 1-5=44.8% (198)
(21) Physically assaultive toward parents and/or other adults in the family	8	0=74.2% (328) 1-5=21.3% (94)
(22) Physically assaultive toward siblings and/or other children in the family	9	0=70.8% (313) 1-5=24.4% (108)
(23) Stealing from family members	10	0=62.7% (277) 1-5=32.4% (143)
(24) Most serious other family problem--rank (and specify): _____	11	0=39.6% (175) 1-5=29.2% (129)

Note: Item #43 is continued on the next page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

43. (Continued):

Note: Rank each listed problem or problem area by filling in the respective boxes with the appropriate numerical values from the following scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not a problem	a very mild problem	a mild problem	a moderate problem	a serious problem	a very serious problem

School Problems

(25) Learning disabled (diagnosed)	12	0=68.6% (303) 1-5=26.0% (115)
(26) Retarded or poor academic performance (i.e., non-production) at school	13	0=53.6% (237) 1-5=41.6% (184)
(27) Poor school attendance or truancy	14	0=49.3% (218) 1-5=46.4% (205)
(28) Disruptive behavior or poor discipline in classroom or school in general	15	0=49.3% (218) 1-5=46.8% (207)
(29) Verbally antagonistic toward teachers and/or other adults at school	16	0=55.9% (247) 1-5=38.9% (172)
(30) Verbally antagonistic toward classmates and/or other children (peers) at school	17	0=55.4% (245) 1-5=39.4% (174)
(31) Physically assaultive toward teachers and/or other adults at school	18	0=81.7% (361) 1-5=12.4% (55)
(32) Physically assaultive toward classmates and/or other children (peers) at school	19	0=70.1% (310) 1-5=24.7% (109)
(33) Engages in stealing at school	20	0=71.7% (317) 1-5=22.2% (98)
(34) Engages in vandalism or destruction of property at school	21	0=80.5% (356) 1-5=13.8% (61)
(35) Most serious other school problem--rank (and specify): _____	22	0=51.4% (227) 1-5=17.0% (75)

Note: Item #43 is continued on the next page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

43. (Continued):

Note: Rank each listed problem or problem area by filling in the respective boxes with the appropriate numerical values from the following scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not a problem	a very mild problem	a mild problem	a moderate problem	a serious problem	a very serious problem

Community Problems

(36) Involved with gang delinquency and/or delinquent acts with peers	23	0=61.8% (273) 1-5=33.7% (149)
(37) Involved in fire setting in the community (including school buildings)	24	0=91.4% (404) 1-5= 4.8% (21)
(38) Pushing or selling drugs in the community (including on school grounds)	25	0=83.3% (368) 1-5=12.0% (53)
(39) Violates limits for public decency (i.e., public sex play, indecent exposure, or other similar behavior)	26	0=88.9% (393) 1-5= 7.0% (31)
(40) Verbally antagonistic toward adult neighbors and/or other adults in the community	27	0=69.5% (307) 1-5=26.0% (115)
(41) Verbally antagonistic toward neighborhood children and/or other children in the community	28	0=71.7% (317) 1-5=23.8% (105)
(42) Physically assaultive toward adult neighbors and/or other adults in the community	29	0=87.1% (385) 1-5= 8.4% (37)
(43) Physically assaultive toward neighborhood children and/or other children in the community	30	0=80.3% (355) 1-5=15.6% (69)
(44) Engages in stealing in the community	31	0=51.4% (227) 1-5=44.8% (198)
(45) Involved in acts of vandalism or destruction of property in the community	32	0=74.0% (327) 1-5=21.7% (96)
(46) Most serious other community problem--rank (and specify): _____ _____ _____	33	0=56.1% (248) 1-5=11.8% (52)

Other Problems

(47) Any other problem not listed above--rank (and specify): _____ _____ _____	34	0=55.0% (243) 1-5= 4.8% (21)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Current vs. Needed (or Ideal) Service/Treatment Setting

46. Using the following codes, please answer the three (3) questions listed below which pertain to general types of service/treatment settings or placements for this child.

In Own Home

1=Placement in own home or home of relatives with individual supervision and related services from the juvenile court

Community-Based (in Own Community)

2=Placement in individual foster home in own community
3=Placement in group home, halfway house, or other specialized group program for (structured) living in own community

Community-Based (Not in Own Community)

4=Placement in individual foster home not in own community
5=Placement in group home, halfway house, or other specialized group program for (structured) living not in own community

Removal from Community or Community Involvement

6=Placement in residential treatment program or institution for rehabilitation (including training schools) which requires a degree of secure detention or custody and well-planned methods of environmental manipulation (i.e., purposeful physical and operational programming) aimed at modifying the youth's behavior
8=Other (specify in the appropriate spaces below)
9=Unknown

a. Using one of the above codes, how would you describe this child's current service/treatment setting in the juvenile justice system? (Fill in the box to the right with the most appropriate code. If you use the "8" code please specify):_____

☐ 35

1=51.6% (228)
2=13.3% (59)
3= 5.2% (23)
4= 3.4% (15)
5= 3.2% (15)
6= 9.0% (40)
8=11.8% (52)
9= 2.5% (11)

b. Using one of the above codes, how would you describe the most ideal service/treatment setting for this child? (Fill in the box to the right with the most appropriate code. If you use the "8" code please specify):_____

☐ 36

1=43.4% (192)
2=11.8% (52)
3= 7.7% (34)
4= 2.5% (11)
5= 5.9% (26)
6=13.3% (59)
8=12.4% (55)
9= 3.0% (13)

c. Using one of the above codes, how would you describe the service/treatment setting this child is most likely to be placed in in the future given the level of current resources available? (Fill in the box to the right with the most appropriate code. If you use the "8" code please specify):_____

☐ 37

1=42.1% (186)
2=13.1% (58)
3= 4.8% (21)
4= 2.3% (10)
5= 5.7% (25)
6=10.4% (46)
8=16.1% (71)
9= 5.7% (25)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

47. Is removal from the child's own home a mandatory aspect or requirement for an ideal service treatment setting for this child? ☐ 38

1=Yes
2=No
8=Other (specify):_____
_____
9=Don't know (not sure)

1=	47.7% (211)
2=	42.8% (189)
8=	5.2% (23)
9=	4.3% (19)

---

48. Using the following codes, please answer the three (3) questions listed below which pertain to specific types of service/treatment settings or placements for this child.

	#48a	#48b
01=Own home or home of relatives	01= 54.8% (242)	46.4% (205)
02=Family shelter care	02= 0.5% (2)	0.5% (2)
03=Foster family home or regular foster home	03= 12.9% (57)	9.5% (42)
04=Special rate foster home	04= 2.5% (11)	2.3% (10)
05=Family group home	05= 1.8% (8)	2.0% (9)
06=Professional shelter care	06= 0.5% (2)	0.7% (3)
07=Professional group home	07= 1.8% (8)	4.8% (21)
08=Adolescent shelter care facility	08= 0.5% (2)	0.9% (4)
09=Mental health residential facility - resident	09= 1.1% (5)	2.3% (10)
10=Mental health residential facility - day only	10= 0.0% (0)	0.5% (2)
11=Child care center	11= 1.4% (6)	1.1% (5)
12=Mentally retarded/developmentally disabled group home	12= 0.7% (3)	1.4% (6)
13=Residential treatment facility	13= 5.9% (26)	10.2% (45)
14=Private agency (specify below)	14= 1.1% (5)	0.5% (2)
15=CSD training school	15= 4.5% (20)	4.1% (18)
16=CSD camp	16= 0.0% (0)	0.5% (2)
17=Migrant day care	17= 0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
18=Supportive/remedial day care	18= 0.0% (0)	0.2% (1)
19=Independent living arrangement	19= 2.0% (9)	2.9% (13)
88=Other (specify below)	88= 5.2% (23)	7.5% (33)
99=Unknown	99= 2.9% (13)	2.1% (9)

a. Using one of the above codes, how would you describe this child's current placement? (Fill in the box to the right with the most appropriate code. If you use the "14" or "88" codes, please specify):_____ ☐☐ 39 40

b. Using one of the above codes, how would you describe or what would you pick as the most or ideal placement for this child? (Fill in the box to the right with the most appropriate code. If you use the "14" or "88" codes, please specify):_____ ☐☐ 41 42

c. Using one of the above codes, how would you describe the placement this child is most likely to be placed in in the future, given the level of current resources available? (Fill in the box to the right with the most appropriate code. If you use the "14" or "88" codes, please specify):_____ ☐☐ 43 44

	#48c
01=	44.1% (195)
02=	0.9% (4)
03=	11.8% (52)
04=	1.6% (7)
05=	1.6% (7)
06=	0.2% (1)
07=	2.5% (11)
08=	0.2% (1)
09=	1.8% (8)
10=	0.0% (0)
11=	0.0% (0)
12=	1.8% (8)
13=	8.4% (37)
14=	0.2% (1)
15=	4.1% (18)
16=	0.2% (1)
17=	0.0% (0)
18=	0.0% (0)
19=	6.3% (28)
88=	8.4% (37)
99=	5.9% (26)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Current vs. Needed (or Ideal) Services/Treatments

49. Using the following codes, please indicate which of the treatment/ services listed below are needed by this child and whether or not they are being received and if so, how adequate are they in terms of his/her current needs:

Codes

0=Does not apply (i.e., service not needed by this child)

1=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as it is not available in this locale

2=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as all slots are filled

3=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as there are no dollars available

4=Service diagnosed as needed and currently being provided to this child but the level of services and/or the quality of service is inadequate for this child's needs

5=Service diagnosed as needed and currently being provided to this child; and the level and quality of service is adequate for this child's needs

8=Child not available to receive services[b]

9=Unknown

Primary Services

a.	Out-of-home care-- except institutionalization (specify):_____	45	0=52.3% (231) 1-5=39.6% (175)
b.	Institutionalization (specify):_____	46	0=78.5% (347) 1-5=12.9% (57)
c.	Mental health day care or other (non-mental health) day care	47	0=82.4% (364) 1-5= 7.7% (34)
d.	School or school-related program (specify):_____	48	0=42.1% (186) 1-5=46.6% (206)
e.	Intensive or regular juvenile court probation supervision	49	0=62.9% (278) 1-5=28.3% (125)
f.	Detention (post-adjudication)	50	0=86.0% (380) 1-5= 5.2% (23)
g.	Other (specify):_____	51	0=62.7% (277) 1-5= 9.0% (40)

Note: Item #49 is continued on the next page

Columns #52-75 Reserved

50. Client (Subject) I.D. Number for Study: ID. NO.

Note: Use I.D. number from cover sheet in the boxes to the right. (76 77 78 79)

51. Card Number: 3 (80)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

49. (Continued)

Codes

0=Does not apply (i.e., service not needed by this child)

1=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as it is not available in this locale

2=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as all slots are filled

3=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as there are no dollars available

4=Service diagnosed as needed and currently being provided to this child but the level of services and/or the quality of service is inadequate for this child's needs

5=Service diagnosed as needed and currently being provided to this child; and the level and quality of service is adequate for this child's needs

9=Unknown

Card 4

Secondary Services

h.	Psychiatric/psychological assessment and/or treatment	1	0=63.6% (281) 1-5=28.5% (126)
i.	Individual counselling	2	0=39.8% (176) 1-5=51.6% (228)
j.	Group counselling	3	0=60.2% (266) 1-5=30.6% (135)
k.	Family counselling	4	0=51.4% (227) 1-5=38.9% (172)
l.	Alcohol Abuse Treatment Services	5	0=77.8% (344) 1-5=12.2% (54)
m.	Drug/Substance Abuse Treatment Services	6	0=75.8% (335) 1-5=14.7% (65)
n.	Employment training and/or placement (including vocational training)	7	0=69.0% (305) 1-5=20.4% (90)
o.	Protective services	8	0=78.3% (346) 1-5=14.5% (64)
p.	Education/GED preparation/tutoring	9	0=61.8% (273) 1-5=22.6% (133)
q.	Recreation program and/or therapy	10	0=68.8% (304) 1-5=22.2% (98)
r.	Play and art therapy	11	0=81.2% (359) 1-5= 9.3% (41)
s.	Big brother/big sister kinship program	12	0=82.6% (365) 1-5= 8.1% (36)
t.	Restitution/community service program	13	0=75.8% (335) 1-5=17.2% (76)
u.	Special education program (including alternative education program)	14	0=64.7% (286) 1-5=19.2% (113)
v.	Parenting education/parent effectiveness training	15	0=61.5% (272) 1-5=25.6% (113)
w.	Supportive services (homemaker or housekeeper) and/or transportation	16	0=81.7% (361) 1-5= 9.7% (43)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

49. (Continued)

Codes

0=Does not apply (i.e., service not needed by this child)

1=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as it is not available in this locale

2=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as all slots are filled

3=Service diagnosed as needed; but currently not being provided to this child as there are no dollars available

4=Service diagnosed as needed and currently being provided to this child but the level of services and/or the quality of service is inadequate for this child's needs

5=Service diagnosed as needed and currently being provided to this child; and the level and quality of service is adequate for this child's needs

9=Unknown

x.	Medical/dental treatment	17	0=52.0% (230) 1-5=31.9% (141)
y.	Other counselling and/or case management programming (specify):_____	18	0=64.3% (284) 1-5=19.2% (85)
z.	Other (specify):_____	19	0=69.7% (308) 1-5= 3.6% (16)

52. Did you indicate in Item #49 (above) that a new primary service was needed for this child? 20

1=Yes 1=17.0% (75)
2=No 2=73.8% (326)
9=Don't know (or not sure) 9= 9.3% (41)

If you answered "yes" please indicate the most important (or specify) what type of service it would be:

_____

53. Did you indicate in Item #49 (above) that a new secondary service was needed for this child? 21

1=Yes 1=16.1% (71)
2=No 2=72.4% (320)
9=Don't know (or not sure) 9=11.5% (51)

If you answered "yes" please indicate the most important (or specify) what type of service it would be:

_____

54. In reviewing this child's total juvenile justice system service needs and the level of likely available resources, how difficult is it to develop a realistic case plan which can result in achievement of general, short term rehabilitation goals or objectives for this child? 22

0=Not difficult at all 0=35.3% (156)
1=Somewhat difficult 1=20.6% (91)
2=Moderately difficult 2=20.8% (92)
3=Very difficult 3=12.0% (53)
4=Extremely difficult, if not impossible 4= 9.0% (40)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

55. In reviewing this child's total juvenile justice system service needs and the level of likely available resources, how difficult is it to develop a realistic case plan which can result in achievement of general, long term rehabilitation goals or objectives for this child? ☐ 23

0=Not difficult at all
1=Somewhat difficult
2=Moderately difficult
3=Very difficult
4=Extremely difficult, if not impossible

0=32.6% (144)
1=16.1% (71)
2=24.7% (109)
3-16.1% (71)
4= 9.0% (40)

Client Assets

56. Does this child have specific attributes, assets, talents, and/or personality characteristics which can help him/her in a rehabilitation (or habilitation) sense? That is, are there assets which can help the child avoid delinquent involvement, behavioral problems, and/or dependency related problems? ☐ 24

0=Not sure
1=Yes (see below)
2=No
8=Other (specify):_____

0=30.5% (135)
1=50.5% (223)
2=12.0% (53)
8= 3.6% (16)

If you said "yes" above, please list the stronger or more salient of these assets below:

_____
_____
_____

Child and Parent Cooperation Ratings

57. Using the codes given below, please rate the extent to which those persons listed have cooperated (recently or currently) in the case planning, treatment (service delivery), and rehabilitation process involved with this child:

Codes

0=The question of cooperation does not apply (i.e., this person is deceased or not at all involved in the child's life)

1=This person is willing to receive juvenile court and/or CSD intervention and has shown considerable or some initiative to correct problems without juvenile court and/or CSD action

2=This person is willing to receive juvenile court and/or CSD intervention but has shown little or no initiative to correct problems with juvenile court and/or CSD action

3=This person deliberately resisted or obstructed juvenile court and/or CSD intervention

9=Don't know or cannot determine

Persons

a.	The child himself/herself	25	0= 6.3% (28) 1=47.5% (210)	2=20.6% (91) 3=14.0% (62)
b.	The child's father, step-father, or male guardian	26	0=31.4% (139) 1=23.1% (102)	2=16.7% (74) 3=17.6% (78)
c.	The child's mother, step-mother, or female guardian	27	0=12.4% (55) 1=38.0% (168)	2=26.5% (117) 3=18.3% (81)
d.	The child's sibling or siblings	28	0=33.3% (147) 1=22.2% (98)	2=12.9% (57) 3= 2.9% (13)
e.	The child's family considered collectively	29	0=13.1% (58) 1=31.9% (141)	2=29.9% (132) 3=11.1% (49)
f.	The child's friends or peers	30	0=32.1% (142) 1=10.4% (46)	2= 7.5% (33) 3= 7.5% (33)
g.	School staff and/or teachers	31	0=25.8% (114) 1=52.3% (231)	2= 4.3% (19) 3= 0.5% (2)
h.	Staff from other (non-school) agencies providing related services	32	0=26.0% (115) 1=50.2% (222)	2= 3.4% (15) 3= 0.5% (2)

*If more than one of these people are present, circle the one currently having the most influence on the child and answer for that person (in the box to the right.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Probability Ratings of the Likelihood of This Child Being Involved in the Following Events

58. Using the codes listed below, indicate how likely or probable it is that this child would become involved in the future in the following events:

Codes

0=Does not apply (technically impossible given the child's current age or other significant status

1=Very low probability-less than 5% chance

2=Low probability-more than 5% chance but no more than 25% chance

3=Moderately low probability-more than 25% chance but less than 50% chance

4=Equal chance probability or 50-50 chance (i.e., equal probability or 50% chance of both happening or not)

5=Moderately high probability-more than 50% chance but no more than 75% chance

6=High probability-more than 75% chance but no more than 90% chance

7=Very high probability-more than 95% chance

8=Other (specify):_____

9=Unknown or cannot determine

Events		
a. Involvement in (a) status offense(s) during the next 12 months	33	0=21.0% (93) 1-3=46.8% (207) 4-7=29.2% (129)
b. Involvement in (a) delinquent offense(s) during the next 12 months	34	0=20.1% (89) 1-3=51.6% (228) 4-7=25.3% (112)
c. Involvement in (a) felony offense(s) during the next 12 months	35	0=19.2% (85) 1-3=61.8% (273) 4-7=14.7% (65)
d. Involvement in (a) criminal offense(s) involving personal injury to a victim during the next 12 months	36	0=20.8% (92) 1-3=68.1% (301) 4-7= 7.2% (32)
e. Commitment (or recommitment) to a state training school during the next 12 months	37	0=33.7% (149) 1-3=51.1% (226) 4-7=11.3% (50)
f. Remand to adult criminal court for prosecution on a criminal offense (excluding "blanket" remands for fishing, boating, game, or traffic offenses) during the next 12 months	38	0=43.2% (191) 1-3=48.0% (212) 4-7= 5.0% (22)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

59. Do you have other comments which you wish to make about this child and/or his/her service needs which was not covered on this form? [ ] 39

1=Yes
2=No

1=26.5% (117)
2=64.5% (285)

If you answered "yes," please list your comments as follows:

60. Please indicate the date this form was completed: Mo. [ ][ ] 40 41 Day [ ][ ] 42 43 Year [ ][ ] 44 45

Columns #46-75 Reserved

61. Client (Subject) I.D. Number for Study: ID. NO.

Note: Use I.D. number from cover sheet in the boxes to the right. [ ][ ][ ][ ] 76 77 78 79

62. Card Number: [4] 80

[a]Please note that the "Unknown" category in these marginal frequencies includes the "Missing Data" values and occasionally a miscoded value which could not be corrected and therefore was interpreted as being unknown.

[b]This code was inadvertently omitted from the final draft of the questionnaire. It is included here as its use was recommended by the author for those questionnaire respondents who contacted him with questions as to its availability and use. Its actual use, however, was rare in this study.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE